

The Medieval Church

The Church in the Time of Constantine.



I. Introduction

The term “medieval” refers to the period of history commonly known as the Middle Ages, between ancient and modern times. Historians usually consider the fall of the Roman Empire as marking the close of ancient times, and the Renaissance and the Reformation as marking the beginning of modern times. The purpose of this article is to provide a background for the study of those portions of the various lines of prophecy in the Revelation that deal with this period of history. The same is true of the article that follows, “The Reformation and Onward.” For the earlier period of church history see Vol. VI, pp. 17–70, and for the church of the Reformation and more recent times, Vol. VII, pp. 41–79.

Decline of the Roman Empire.—The decline and fall of the Roman Empire covers a period of several centuries. The brilliant reign of the first emperor, Augustus (27 B.C.–A.D. 14; see Vol. VI, pp. 72–75), marked the golden age of Roman history. With a few exceptions, the emperors from Augustus on to the last one (deposed 476) were seldom more than mediocre, and the story of the Western Roman Empire throughout almost its entire lifetime of some five centuries, especially from Marcus Aurelius onward, is one of gradual decline. By the close of the 3d century A.D. the process of disintegration had reached an advanced stage. It is true that the reorganization of the empire by Diocletian

and Constantine (see pp. 18–20) served, for a time, to check the downward trend, but thereafter the process of dissolution proceeded at an increasingly rapid pace. With the 4th century began the long series of barbarian invasions from the north (see pp. 20–22), which greatly hastened the process.

Although the last emperor in the West was deposed in 476, there remained an emperor in the East at Constantinople, as there had been ever since Constantine's removal of the seat of government there from Rome in 330. In fact, the Eastern Roman Empire continued for nearly a thousand years longer, to 1453. It is true that 476 is the traditional date for the end of ancient Rome, and thus of the beginning of the Middle Ages, but it is apparent that medieval times might also be reckoned from any one of various other significant points of time either before or after that year. Accordingly, some have considered the reign of Constantine the Great (the first of the long line of so-called Christian emperors) as an appropriate boundary marker between ancient and medieval times, and in view of the fact that the article dealing with the early church in Vol. VI traces developments down approximately to the reign of Constantine, the present article will follow the course of events from his time onward. Others suggest the reign of Justinian the Great (527–565) and the Gothic Wars as dividing between ancient and medieval history. However, historians generally consider the pontificate of Pope Gregory the Great (590–604; see p. 25) as the most appropriate point from which to reckon the Middle Ages. The two most significant institutions of Western Europe during the medieval period were the Roman Catholic Church and, from 800 onward, the Holy Roman Empire.

Development of the Church.—As the Roman Empire gradually declined, the church correspondingly expanded and augmented its power. As established by its Divine Founder, the church was at first characterized by admirable purity of life and clarity of doctrine (see on Rev. 2:2–6). It had a relatively simple and effective organization which stands in contrast with the complex monarchical system that characterizes the medieval papacy. Beginning as an outlawed sect, rejected and harassed by the Jews, scorned and vilified by cultured pagans, and persecuted intermittently by a pagan Roman government determined to exterminate it, Christianity nevertheless grew numerically, in extent (see *The Church Before Paul's Missionary Journeys* and *The Church in the Time of Constantine*, *The Church at the Close of Paul's Ministry*), and in the esteem of thinking men. See Vols. IV, pp. 834–838; VI, p. 61.

By the 3d century the church began to have its own buildings for worship, and, though not legalized itself, began to own property. Its organization became more elaborate. The presiding elders of the congregations in the large cities acquired a unique position as “overseers,” and then as ruling bishops, centers of a growing ecclesiastical authority (see Vol. VI, pp. 37–43). When disputes over doctrinal matters rent the church, and sects began to form, the bishops were looked to—because of the belief in “apostolic succession”—as paragons of orthodoxy, and each in turn began to look back to his predecessors for precedents in interpreting and applying the traditions of the church. In the doctrinal disputes that occurred increasingly, confidence was weakened in the Bible as the sole expression of doctrinal faith, and tradition was appealed to more and more. As the church expanded it borrowed, sometimes consciously and sometimes unconsciously, from the pagans it was conquering, and practices entirely unknown in the apostolic church became a part of church life (see Vol. VI, pp. 64–67). Thus while external

consolidation and expansion were being achieved, internally the church began to lose its apostolic simplicity and purity, and even before it attained legal status the foundations had been laid for the development of the proud, earth-centered church of the Middle Ages.

II. Christian Rome, the Papacy (A.D. 313–590)

Constantine and Christianity.—When Constantine the Great achieved the purple in 311 he found himself at the head of an empire that suffered from an unwieldy administrative system, a disorganized army, and a panicky economy. In addition, the morale of the polyglot population, of variegated origins and customs, was bankrupt ethically and spiritually. The policy of Constantine, a farseeing ruler, was to rally the people of the empire to reconstruct its institutions and to achieve a unity it had not enjoyed for two centuries.

He set about to reorganize the army, to strengthen the economic life of the empire, and to find a panacea for the social, moral, and spiritual ills of the people. He came to believe that a unification of all religions would be a major contribution to the unity and stability of the empire—a formidable task in the face of the endless varieties of religion and social customs that existed. Himself a worshiper of the sun in the form of Apollo, Constantine was willing to recognize Jesus Christ—“the Sun of Righteousness”—as another manifestation of the sun deity. In certain similarities between the church and paganism that had resulted from reciprocal borrowing, he at first thought he saw an opportunity for forging a unified imperial sun cult, uniting Christians and sun worshipers. His nominal conversion to Christianity did not take place until 323 or 325.

But prior to that, Constantine had taken an even more dramatic and far-reaching step. In 313 he had induced his coemperor Licinius to join him in a decree granting full religious liberty throughout the empire, particularly specifying Christianity as a sect that was henceforth to be recognized and accorded full rights. Up to this time Christians had looked upon the government as an enemy because it was pagan. They had, in obedience to Paul’s admonition, honored the government as a necessary bond for holding society together, but had also applied the Lord’s instruction to render to Caesar only that which legitimately belonged to him. Further, in order that God might have the precedence, Peter had instructed that, when it was impossible to do both, Christians must make the choice of obeying God rather than men. Tertullian (c. 200) and Lactantius (4th century) had both insisted that the emperor must not intrude upon the freedom of the church to worship God. Adopting these principles, the church had, in spite of lack of freedom, proceeded to do its work for God on earth, often facing persecution but also taking full advantage of toleration when it was extended.

When Constantine legalized the church in 313 it was forced to review its opinion of the state, and it hailed a benevolent government as its friend. Constantine followed his decree of liberation with other decrees favoring the church in its various operations, with grants of funds, of privileges, and of powers, both judicial and executive.

Since many Christians had been using Sunday as a day of worship for more than a century and a half, and since many sun worshipers had come to regard the first day of the week as the special astrological “day of the sun,” he issued the world’s first Sunday law (321), calling for rest from labor on that day (see Vol. VI, pp. 48–52).

Constantine did not make Christianity the state religion, but in some respects a bureau of the state. The church accepted these seeming benefits with gratification, not realizing

the inherent danger in them until the question arose as to whether the state should dominate the church.

The death of Constantine revealed what had always been a weakness of the Roman constitution, the lack of an established provision for the imperial succession. The rule of the empire devolved upon the three sons of Constantine, one of them taking the western portion, another the central, and the third the eastern. Though the empire was not formally partitioned, its administration was divided, following an example that had been set for Constantine by the awkward arrangement of his predecessor, Diocletian. Of the three sons of Constantine, one was an Arian (see pp. 22, 23), and the church in the West, strongly anti-Arian, endured for a time the rule of an Arian emperor.

Compromise and Apostasy.—During and after Constantine's reign the church, relieved of anxiety concerning its relationships with the state, became involved in doctrinal controversies that resulted in crystallized dogma, and thus Christianity became a creedal system. The church had achieved seeming success in the sight of men, but it had already apostatized in the sight of God. Paganism had been Christianized, but simultaneously Christianity had absorbed a great deal that was pagan. The church was triumphant in the world, but not in its own soul; and when the emperor Julian, a nephew of Constantine and an apostate from Christianity who had sought to revive paganism, died of battle wounds, he is supposed to have confessed, "Galilean, thou hast conquered." He did not realize that it was the corruption of the Galilean's followers that had caused him to turn away from the Galilean.

Augustine, the North African theologian, now picked up boldly and expanded the earlier teaching of Origen of Alexandria, that the church need no longer look for its triumph to a cataclysmic end of the world at the second coming of Christ. Instead, he said, it should look to a gradual achievement of success as the victorious "city of God" on earth, conquering the satanic "city" of this world (see p. 21). To accomplish this became the hope and objective of the steadily apostatizing church as a great politico-ecclesiastical system, which has guided its policy ever since. Indeed, the church increasingly became the institutional hope of men, as the empire declined.

The decrees of Constantine and his active support of religion did not stay the fatal disease that was eating away at the heart of Rome. Political, economic, social, and moral decay continued. The fall of Rome had no single cause. It fell apart largely from internal decay, and from external causes also.

The Barbarian Infiltration.—For centuries before they became a menace, barbarian tribes to the north had been gazing over the *limites* of Rome, amazed at its wealth and at the comforts its people enjoyed. In the boundary wars of Rome large groups of northern tribesmen were taken captive, sold into slavery, and used as gladiators in the circuses and as auxiliary soldiers in the army of Rome. Occasionally these tribesmen would return home with stories of Rome's wealth, and the barbarians began to wish for a share in these material good things. Barbarian veterans of auxiliary legions were settled as garrison troops along the borders, to fend off attacks from their own relatives seeking to cross the border. As the pressure of these covetous tribes became greater and greater, bands of fighting men would gather around a chieftain, and families, clans, and finally whole tribes, broke across the borders. For a long time Rome was able to absorb these immigrants, settling them upon vacated lands and using them to augment the empire's depleted labor force. Occasionally, leaders of these Teutonic barbarians, mainly

Germanic, attained political power within the empire, and in spite of laws that forbade the marriage of a Latin with a German, intermarriage began to take place. Everywhere west of the Adriatic and the Danube Valley the beginnings of a Romano-Teutonic culture began to form as early as the 4th century.

Arianism.—The Arian heresy (see Vol. V, p. 914; see on Dan. 7:8), adopted by several of the barbarian tribes, should be discussed here. It was a problem to Roman Catholicism and the papacy more on the ecclesiastico-political than on the spiritual and theological level. The Arians declared that they had only one God, the Father, with Jesus Christ accepted into the realm of subordination to God. This teaching appeared much simpler than Trinitarianism, and the pagan tribes who entered the empire had therefore the more readily accepted Arianism. (For a discussion of the theological aspects of Arianism, see under Additional Note to John 1 in Vol. V, pp. 914, 915.)

However, the Arian branch of Christianity never perfected a thoroughgoing ecclesiastical organization, as did Roman Catholicism with its papal hierarchy; and in the 5th and 6th centuries Arianism seems to have lacked the aggressiveness of the Roman Church. Western Catholicism had its greatest difficulty with this sect in the mid-4th century, when the sons of Constantine, one of whom was an Arian, ruled the empire. At one time the bishop of Rome actually was led to subscribe to Arian teaching. In the East, Arianism continued more strongly and weakened the Greek Orthodox Church for a time.

The Barbarian Invasions.—The time of peaceful Germanic infiltration was followed by the flood. Whole tribes moved across the borders from the north, sometimes following the river valleys and seeming to inundate the empire. The barbarian hordes came in, not to see but to possess, and where their objectives were resisted, they fought, ravaged, and destroyed. Not only the provincial cities were besieged, but Rome itself was attacked. Augustine was pondering the great theme of his book *The City of God* while the Vandals were besieging Carthage in North Africa (430). The people of the Roman Empire could scarcely believe that Rome and other great cities were being attacked.

The Visigoths, already Arian Christians when they moved into the empire, swept down into Italy, sacked Rome (410), then moved across the northern Mediterranean littoral into Gaul (France), and finally into Spain, where they established a kingdom. This kingdom, however, failed to survive a later invasion by the Moslem Moors of North Africa (711–719), and from its ruins has come the Spain of today. Leaving some of their number in Swabia, the Suevi moved across Gaul (406) and occupied the northwest corner of the Spanish peninsula, where was laid the foundation of present-day Portugal. The Burgundians, also Arian Christians, migrated into Switzerland, and occupied the Rhone Valley of Gaul. They left the Nibelungenlied as an epic of their struggles. The Alamanni moved across what is now Germany and settled in western areas. The Franks, a pagan Germanic people, occupied Gaul, where they soon accepted Roman Catholic Christianity. The Angles, Saxons, and Jutes, crossing the North Sea from the Frisian lands of the Netherlands and Denmark, landed in Britain, drove back the Celtic Britons, and became the dominant inhabitants of the land (c. 450–455). They too became Roman Catholic. The Lombards crossed the Alps and entered Italy (568), where they were a sore trial to the Byzantine governors of Italy and to the popes of Rome. They were also brought into the Church of Rome.

These were not all. The Arian Vandals had preceded the Visigoths, moving across Gaul into Spain (409), and then had crossed at the Strait of Gibraltar into North Africa,

where, turning eastward, they occupied the prosperous cultured cities of colonial Rome (430). North Africa was a center of Roman Catholic Christianity, but the Vandals were of a persecuting turn of mind and were determined that the Roman Catholics should become Arian in faith. The results were unhappy indeed for the Roman Catholic Christians of North Africa, who were in no position to defend themselves. Finally the emperor Justinian, seated in Constantinople, but having the whole of the empire under his nominal rule, sent armies into North Africa, and by 534 had completely vanquished the Vandals. Under the influence of the Church of Rome, one of the “ten horns” of Daniel, descriptive of the Germanic tribes of Western Europe, was thus uprooted (see on Dan. 7:8).

In the 5th century, long before the Lombards entered Italy (568), some members of various Germanic tribes had become auxiliaries in the Roman army in the vicinity of Rome, and Odovacar, a leader of these Germanic tribes, was appointed general over the auxiliaries. In 475 the Western emperor Nepos was driven into exile, and the successful rebel Orestes elevated his 14-year-old son Romulus Augustulus to the purple. Orestes caused a mutiny among his mercenaries by refusing to accede to their demand for a division among them of one third of the soil of Italy. Odovacar now took things into his own hands, and in September, 476, he was proclaimed king, while Orestes was made prisoner and beheaded. Augustulus was removed from the throne, but his life was spared. This revolution, which occurred in A.D. 476, is sometimes considered as marking the end of the Western Roman Empire.

It must be noted that Odovacar did not claim to be emperor, nor did any barbarian king of that era make such a claim. Indeed, Odovacar took the insignia of imperial rule that he found in Rome and sent them to Constantinople, saying that he would have no use for them, nor would anyone else, for there would not again be anyone ruling as emperor in the West. The Eastern emperor was then titular ruler of the whole Roman Empire.

But Odovacar and his Arian followers soon found themselves at odds with the Roman Catholic authorities and later in trouble with the invading hordes of Ostrogoths from the East, who, under the benevolent Theodoric, occupied Italy. After less than twenty years of the Herulian and Rugian rule of Odovacar, the latter was put to death by Theodoric, and the Ostrogoths came into undisputed control. Under Theodoric's successors, the Arian Ostrogoths continued at odds with the Catholics. Then Justinian, emperor in Constantinople, came to the aid of the Roman Church, whose bishop he had recognized by law as “head of all the churches.” Having only recently conquered the Vandals, he now sent his forces into Italy. For twenty years his armies campaigned against the Ostrogoths. By 538 the Ostrogoths were driven from Rome, which they occupied only temporarily afterward, and by 554 they ceased to exist as a people. Thus the third and last of the tribes that proved unable to live at peace with the Church of Rome came to an end. See on Dan. 7:8.

The tribes that remained became the forerunners of the European nations of today. They either turned from paganism to Roman Catholicism or were converted to it from Arianism.

Conversion of the Barbarian Tribes.—In England the Angles and Saxons, who had entered the empire as pagans, became Roman Catholic about the year A.D. 600. In France the Franks, who entered as pagans, became Roman Catholic before A.D. 500. Into Germany, which in the Latin and French languages is “the land of the Alemans,” the Alamanni entered as pagans and became Roman Catholic at about the same time as the

Franks. Into Switzerland and Burgundian France (the Rhone Valley), the Burgundians entered as Arian Christians, accepting Roman Catholicism about A.D. 520. Into northern Italy the Lombards entered as pagans and became Roman Catholic about A.D. 600. Into Portugal the Suevi, a branch of the Germanic tribe that gave its name to Swabia in Germany, entered as Arian Christians and became Roman Catholic about A.D. 575. Into Spain the Visigoths also entered as Arians and became Roman Catholics about the same time. The three principal tribes that disappeared were the Herulian-Rugians in Rome under Odovacar, the Ostrogoths, who replaced them but likewise disappeared from Italy about A.D. 554, and the Arian Vandals in North Africa, who were cut to pieces in A.D. 534. Each of these resisted Roman Catholicism and was destroyed as a people.

Greek Orthodox Caesaropapism.—Unlike the Western church, the Greek-speaking Catholic Church, which came to be called the Greek Orthodox Church, was weakened by its struggle against Arianism and by a number of other serious theological controversies that did not particularly trouble the West (see pp. 28, 29). Another difficulty experienced by the Greek Church arose from its relationships with the Roman emperors of the East, seated in Constantinople. The imperial government of the East generally dominated the Greek Orthodox Church. Although many of the Eastern emperors were weak men, the church was never able to operate independently of the government, but existed under a relationship to the state which has been called caesaropapism. This expression describes a close union of church and state, with the emperor having a large influence in ecclesiastical affairs. The line of emperors was not seriously interrupted in the East as it was in the West, and the Patriarch of Constantinople was never able to rise quite to the height of power that the pope in the West attained. Another divisive element lay in the fact that Eastern orthodoxy always acknowledged several patriarchs, equal in rank, thus depriving the Patriarch of Constantinople of full ecclesiastical power.

Papal Power Fills the Political Vacuum.—It was on the political side that the Roman Catholic Church had its difficulty with the Germanic Arians. During the Constantinian era, the period of Constantine and his immediate successors, the empire of the West experienced a serious economic depression. There had been floods, droughts, local wars, and problems of taxation and labor supply that resulted in a breakdown of the agricultural economy, and as a result thousands of acres of land were left idle. Mediterranean commerce had been seriously impeded by war, and especially by the piracy of the marauding Vandals of North Africa.

The cost of operating a clumsy and venal bureaucratic government had become enormous, and high taxes were levied upon whole communities, with the municipal authorities responsible for the payment of the heavy exactions. When unable to meet the levies, these officials were subjected to severe punishment. They frequently fled the cities to become fugitives in remote country districts, often yielding themselves to the patronage of the remaining wealthy landowners. This was the beginning of feudalism, on the economic side.

Into this situation in the Western half of the Roman Empire the barbarians infiltrated en masse. Suffering as it was under economic hardship and governmental mismanagement, the populace resisted very little the coming of the barbarians, and even hoped that with the collapse of central government and the formation of local administrations by the new earls and counts, they might enjoy some measure of economic and political relief.

The situation, of course, constituted a problem for the Roman Catholic Church and its bishops. With the collapse of Roman provincial and municipal government the Roman Catholic bishops were, in many cases, left as the most influential officials, and the people looked to them for leadership. In more than one situation the bishop served as mayor or provincial governor, and occasionally even took over command of local armed forces. When the invading tribal leaders, who bore the title of counts, moved in, there arose both political and religious rivalry between these men and the Roman Catholic bishops. Eventually, in many cases, the difficulties were solved cooperatively by the bishop and the count. It became a common practice to hold mixed provincial councils at which bishops and nobles sat down together. Ecclesiastical as well as political and economic problems were discussed at these councils. Thus, gradually, Roman life and politics in the West became Romano-Germanic life and politics, and the culture took on a new complexion. With the destruction, or conversion, of the Arian tribes, some of the causes of difference were removed. Gradually a division of power and influence was recognized, and Western Europe began to emerge from its mixed Germanic and Latin cultural background. The German bishops and abbots naturally looked to their own kings for political leadership, but they looked to the pope of Rome for leadership in ecclesiastical matters.

But the church was in a large measure the heir and preserver of the surviving elements of the old Roman culture in Western Europe. The church inherited, for example, its monarchical and hierarchical form, its language, its capital and geographical divisions, its prestige as the center of authority and culture; also certain religious rites, and even the pope's title "Pontifex Maximus." It was "the continuation of the Roman Empire." (See *Source Book*, No. 1359.)

The fact that there was no emperor in the West after the expulsion of Romulus Augustulus from the Western throne in A.D. 476 obviously gave the papacy a remarkable opportunity to move into the vacancy thus created. The church took as the basis of its claim to power the removal by Constantine of the capital of the Roman Empire from Rome to Constantinople. A monk of the latter years of the 8th century actually made this thesis of imperial evacuation the basis for a document that he wrote and titled the Donation of Constantine. In this document it was pretended that Constantine willed to the pope of Rome not only ecclesiastical authority in the West but broadly interpreted political power and material possessions that would have made him virtually ruler of the West. Such the medieval popes actually claimed to be.

III. The Early Middle Ages (A.D. 590–800)

Emergence of the Monarchical Papacy.—The 6th century witnessed a remarkable increase in papal power. It began with the papacy in weakness, dominated by the emperor Justinian in Constantinople, the emperor who had authorized the destruction of the Vandals in North Africa and of the Ostrogoths in Italy. As a matter of fact, it was the removal of these barbarian tribes that, in no small measure, opened the way for the development of papal power, and prepared for the imposing pontificate of Pope Gregory I, called "the Great," from 590 to 604.

Gregory systematized church ritual and promoted monasticism, which was gradually becoming popular in the West though still looked upon with some suspicion. He was vitally interested in missionary activity, and was responsible for sending the monk Augustine to Britain to introduce Roman Catholicism there. However, Christianity had

gained a firm foothold in Britain long before this. He organized troops for the defense of the city of Rome against the Lombards, who were both a thorn in the papal flesh and a real menace to his power. He became virtually the civil governor of Rome and its surrounding territories, practically replacing the weak exarch of Ravenna, who was supposed to govern Italy for the Byzantine emperors. From then on, despite weak popes, the papacy continued to grow in power, while the influence of the emperor at Constantinople became less and less in the West and finally vanished. The distinction between Western, or Latin, and Eastern, or Greek, Christianity became more and more marked.

Monasticism.—The five centuries beginning in the mid-6th century have been called the monastic age because members of the monastic orders came to represent an increasingly large and influential segment of society. The monasteries developed leaders who exercised a molding influence on Europe and helped to strengthen the papacy.

Monasticism, which means “living alone,” had existed before the Christian Era in paganism, among individuals who sought the cultivation of the inner life in seclusion and asceticism. In the church it began with individuals who withdrew from society in an attempt to practice Christianity on a higher plane than was expected of the ordinary church members. As early as the 4th century men fled, not so much from the world as from churches already become worldly to their eyes, to the desert, at first near Alexandria, Egypt, and soon elsewhere. Presently the hermits became so numerous that they gathered into communities and began to follow rules of conduct, with hours specified for devotion, meals, labor, and study. These monks soon constituted a huge army, which the church was wise enough to hold within its grasp rather than lose as critical schismatics.

The monastic movement quickly spread throughout Christendom, drawing men from normal economic, social, and family life. It spread to the Latin West, where in the 6th century Benedict of Nursia drew up a practical monastic rule, adapted to Western conditions. In time numerous monasteries following the Benedictine rule were founded over the length and breadth of Western Europe. However, the rule was virtually the only tie among them, for each monastery was autonomous. Vows of poverty, obedience, and celibacy were, presumably, to be maintained by all the orders.

Their influence was felt far beyond the cloisters, not only in religious teaching but also in administrative, economic, and political circles. As a broad generalization it can be said that only in the monasteries was the light of learning preserved and the ancient literature saved for later ages by the monk copyists. But increasing influence, wealth, and power brought abuses and corruption among both monks and clergy, which resulted in reforms introduced by the Cluniac order (see p. 29) and others.

The Rise of Islam.—Less than a century after the death of the emperor Justinian the Eastern Roman Empire was confronted by a dangerous foe, Islam. Mohammed was a little-known Arabian merchant with meager education. In his travels he had contact with both Jews and Christians and read at least a little in the Hebrew Scriptures and perhaps in the Christian New Testament. Mohammed decided that the superstitious animism of the Arabs was wrong and that there was only one God, to whom worship belonged exclusively. He began to claim that he himself was God’s prophet, one of a long line which included the Hebrew prophets and Jesus of Nazareth, but of which he himself was the greatest and clearest teacher of truth.

Islam declared the utter sovereignty of God (Arabic, Allah) but knew nothing of atonement for sin and had no priesthood. There was no savior. The will of Allah was supreme, and those who lived a life of obedience to his will could anticipate enjoying the beauties and pleasures of Paradise.

Mohammed met with bitter opposition when he began to preach, but nevertheless gathered some followers. The historic birth of the movement dates from Mohammed's hegira, or flight, from Mecca to Medina. This occurred in A.D. 622, and is the date from which all Moslem chronology is reckoned.

It was only after Mohammed's death that Islam began to take on the force of a great political and military movement. The primitive spiritism of the Arabs was bankrupt as a religion, and the people of the desert were ripe for a new religious experience. Therefore Islam spread among the desert tribes as though borne upon the winds, and the Arabs proved to be fervent devotees of the new faith. The leadership of Mohammed, but not his prophetic gift, was passed on at his death to certain of his male relatives, the caliphs, who became the temporal and spiritual rulers of the growing Mohammedan empire.

The growth of this astonishing empire came just at the time when Eastern Rome was weakened by costly and bloody wars with the Neo-Persian Empire. Not until 628, only six years after the Hegira, had the emperor Heraclius been able, finally, to defeat the Persians. It was therefore an exhausted Eastern Rome that met the attacks of the furious, zealous Islamic Arabs. The Arabs struck north and attacked Palestine, Syria, and the Persian Empire at the same time. The Persian capital fell in 636. Jerusalem surrendered in 637, followed by the capture of Antioch in Syria. Egypt was taken in 640.

The Moslems now built a great fleet and proceeded westward, conquering province after province in North Africa and filling the partial vacuum created by the extinction of the Vandals. In the meantime Slavic tribes had been moving down from the north into the region of the Balkans and the Danube Valley, and the Eastern Roman Empire found itself severely pressed on all sides.

Continuing their westward march across North Africa, the Moslems crossed the Strait of Gibraltar in 711. Finding the Visigoths rent by internal disorders and politically disorganized, the former were able, within two years, to conquer all of Spain except the mountainous Biscay coast, where the Basques remained free. Twenty years later, in 732, the Moslems crossed the Pyrenees and invaded Gaul, or France, where they were halted. In a bloody battle near Poitiers they were defeated by a Frankish leader, Charles Martel, and turned back with severe losses.

France Champions the Cause of the Papacy.—Charles Martel founded what was virtually a new dynasty in France. The Franks had established themselves in Roman Gaul more than two centuries previously under their tribal leader Chlodowech, or Clovis, who led them into Roman Catholicism. Upon Clovis' death the country had been divided among his sons, and later their successors, who ruled their small kingdoms with an almost unbelievable record of petty civil war and bloody violence. The Merovingian line, descended from Clovis, was now weak. Charles Martel was the chief officer, or "mayor," of the palace. He had led the Frankish forces in conquests that had not only consolidated the Frankish kingdom but had taken over much of adjoining western and southern Germany. His defeat of the Moslems assured the safety of southern France.

Charles disregarded the rights of the last of the Merovingian house and provided that his own sons become rulers of the Frankish empire. Charles's son Pepin, who became

sole ruler of the Frankish realm, took the title of king in 752 and held it until his death in 768. One of the things accomplished during his reign was a reform of the Frankish clergy. This reform was accomplished through Boniface, a monk from England who became archbishop of the Frankish church and missionary to the still-pagan Germans.

A significant act of Pepin's reign was his invasion of Italy and his defeat of the Lombards there. When he declared his intention of coming into Italy, Pope Stephen II, in recognition of his avowed objective of freeing the papacy from the pressure of the Lombards, legitimized his claim to kingship by crowning him king of the Franks. Pepin defeated the Lombards, restored Stephen to occupancy of the city of Rome and to the properties the pope claimed, and then granted "to Peter" all the territories the Lombards had taken from the exarch of Ravenna, who had been governing Italy for the emperor at Constantinople. This Donation of Pepin, as it is called, marks the beginning of the Papal States of the Middle Ages.

IV. The High Middle Ages (A.D. 800–1216)

Charlemagne.—It was Pepin's son Charles, known in history as Charlemagne, that is, Charles the Great, who completed the rounding out of the Frankish empire and consolidated medieval Europe. He completed the conquest of the Lombards of Italy, whose iron crown he assumed, and conquered the German Saxons. He also drove the Moslems back from the region of the Pyrenees. Charlemagne strengthened the internal political organization of his empire, assigning counts to each area and organizing annual missions, or delegations, each made up of a count and a bishop, who went from place to place inspecting and regulating affairs in his name. This aided in a further reformation of the Frankish church. Charlemagne protected the church in his realm, reorganized it, and dominated it, even to the control of the pope. He enforced Sunday laws on a new basis—regarding Sunday as based on the fourth commandment. He also gave attention to a form of education, a much-needed development.

Late in the year 800 Charlemagne moved down into Italy, where Pope Leo had encountered serious difficulty with some of his personal enemies. Charlemagne investigated the case and restored Leo to his papal throne in the city of Rome. On Christmas Day the king and his retinue, along with the pope and his attendants, were at service in the old church then standing on the site of the present Basilica of St. Peter. At the conclusion of the service Leo stepped up to the kneeling Charlemagne, placed a diadem upon his head, and declared him Charles Augustus, Emperor of the Romans.

That Charlemagne had planned this affair is doubtful, but that he had given some thought to a time when he should assume the title of Roman emperor is quite probable. It had been 324 years since any Western king had borne the title of emperor of the Romans. From the year 800, almost continuously, there would be a Western Roman emperor, at least in title, until Napoleon unseated the last one in the year 1806. However, there were now really two empires, an Eastern and a Western, and not simply two portions of one empire, as formerly.

The Iconoclastic Controversy.—Theological controversy also contributed to this sundering process between East and West. What proved to be perhaps the most prolonged and bitter argument was concerned with the nature of Jesus Christ. For an extended discussion of the course of this conflict see Vol. V, pp. 911–916. It is significant, however, that these great theological controversies did not particularly involve the Western Church (see Vol. IV, p. 836). In the West, Christianity was not rent by any

major divergence in theological thinking. Rome found its way along a rather practical path of doctrinal teaching during these centuries, and was able to lead along the road of Roman orthodoxy the churches it had helped to found throughout Western Europe. The fact that the East was rent with controversy and that these controversies were solved in Greek terms led to an increasing separation between East and West.

The division was accentuated by the outbreak of the iconoclastic controversy, the dispute with the “image breakers.” As already noted, the 8th and 9th centuries found the Eastern half of the Roman Empire involved in a terrific struggle against the spread of Islam. The Moslems were intense monotheists, fanatically insisting that there is but one God, in Arabic called Allah. With that there came a determined rejection of the use of any kind of statue, image, or picture in religious worship. In this, Islam was marching along with Judaism, which interpreted the second commandment of the Mosaic Decalogue as forbidding any physical portrayal of Deity.

The controversies concerning the nature of Christ as the unique Son of God that had been rending Eastern Christianity presented a distressing contrast to the simple monotheism of Islam. More than this, from the 3d century onward there had been an increasing use in the church of pictures and, later, images of Jesus. These portrayals were used first as aids to devotion for simple Christian folk who could not read the Scriptures for themselves. Gradually the practice developed of venerating these images. The appearance of various statues of Jesus, as well as those of the Virgin Mary and of the saints, increased rapidly in the church, and the spectacle of Christians kneeling and praying before these statues became common.

All this the Moslems called idolatry; wherever they found opportunity in the provinces they conquered they considered it a virtue to destroy the images. There were many, also, within the Eastern Church itself who keenly felt Christianity’s inability to meet this challenge of Islam. Hence a strong movement developed within the church to eliminate all kinds of images of the person of Jesus. Those behind this movement came to be called Iconoclasts, and as such were not satisfied merely to dispute the right of the church to have the images, they even took active measures at times to destroy them.

So serious did this dispute become during the 8th century that a second Council of Nicaea was called in A.D. 787, to decide which view was right. Should images continue to be used in the churches, or should they not? Should there be painted representations, or not? The Western Church had already made clear, through a declaration by Pope Stephen III, that it wished the use of images to continue. When the council met, Iconoclasm was condemned, the iconoclastic bishops yielded or were deposed, and image worship was restored. However, this council did not end the controversy, and eventually the Greek Orthodox Church reverted to the exclusive use of two-dimensional representations, ruling out the three-dimensional, which the Western Church maintained. Hence today one sees pictures of the Christ, but no statues, in Greek and Russian Orthodox churches, while in the Western Church one sees both.

Schism Between East and West.—It has been pointed out that in the early centuries, because of differences of language, of culture, of theological outlook, and of doctrinal views, the Eastern and Western wings of the church had gradually drawn apart. This tendency was accelerated by the virtual end of the influence of the Eastern emperors in the West, particularly after the latter had to divert their attentions and energies to stave off the spread of Mohammedanism. The iconoclastic controversy helped to widen the

breach, and in the 11th century other differences were accentuated, both of ritual and of theological interpretation. Among these were the questions of whether leaven should be used in the sacramental bread (the Western Church took the view that it should), whether there should be fasting on the Sabbath (the Eastern Church took the view that there should not), and whether the clergy should marry (the Western Church taking the position that they should not). These differences, and others of less significance, presently became acute. The patriarch of Constantinople hurled anathemas at the pope of Rome, and the pope hurled anathemas at the patriarch. Finally, in the year 1054, the crisis came. The patriarch and the pope each proceeded to excommunicate the other. This schism, separating the Eastern and Western churches, has never been healed.

Division of Charlemagne's Empire.—Further note must be taken of the great changes that, by the year 800, had come into what was once the Roman Empire. The Eastern half of the empire was Greek-speaking and Greek-thinking, although it still considered itself essentially Roman. It was much restricted in territory, being pressed from the north by the Slavs and from the east and the south by the Islamic hordes. All North Africa, once a center of Latin culture, was in the hands of the Moslems, and so was Spain. The Latin language, once universally spoken in the West, was gradually developing into Italian in Italy, French in France, and so on. The Lombards and Franks were still using their Teutonic dialects. Charlemagne, the new Western Roman emperor, ruled northern Italy, and the territory from northern Spain through France and the Netherlands to the borders of Denmark, and eastward approximately to the Elbe.

Before Charlemagne died he divided the rule of his empire among his three sons. His intention was to have one son rule the central area, roughly corresponding to the Lowland region west of the Rhine, Lorraine, and Italy; another to rule over Germany, which became the basis of the so-called Holy Roman Empire; and the third to be king of France and northern Spain. Although this triple bequest was upset by the premature death of two of the emperor's sons, it laid the foundation for the national boundaries of medieval Europe, but also resulted in jealousies, disputes, and conflicts that kept Western Europe in turmoil.

The Cluniac Reform of the Church.—In the 9th and 10th centuries the papal chair was occupied by weak, and often wicked, men. The church was decadent, and spiritual and moral life suffered tragically. Culture was at a low ebb. The successors of Charlemagne restored the title of Roman emperor and intermarried with the imperial house of Constantinople. It even looked for a time as though the old Roman Empire might be restored as a united dominion, but this did not take place. Attempts were made to restore the prestige of the papacy, and several German bishops who proved capable administrators occupied the papal throne in Rome. This meant that the papacy was, for a time, under the supervision of the Holy Roman Empire.

In the 10th century there arose in France a remarkable movement for church reform, stemming from the founding (910) of the Abbey of Cluny, near Mâcon, under a modified Benedictine rule. Other cloisters were brought under the rule of Cluny, and from that order there went out dedicated men whose purpose it was to purify the church. Increasingly they gained positions of influence in various parts of Western Europe, and eventually came to dominate the church.

The Cluniac reform, as this movement is known, had a definite program. It insisted primarily on a reform of monastic life, which had deteriorated. Actually, of course, the

monastery had a right to call for reform only on the monastic level. But as its pupils went out and secured places of influence in the church, the reform assumed a wider program. It called for a change in the life of the clergy. It demanded that church property should be managed for the good of the church and not for the benefit of those who had the administration of it. To achieve this end, the reformers demanded the freedom of the church from the control of kings and the nobility, who after all were but laymen, and full assertion of the rights of the church.

Since the bishops and abbots of the church were for the most part men of noble blood who wielded great political influence in their own right, it had become important for kings and dukes to secure the appointment to high ecclesiastical office of men who would cooperate with them in the administration of the affairs of their kingdoms and duchies. Hence, it had become customary for bishops and abbots to be appointed by the empire and its agents. This, the Cluniac reformers insisted, must cease. Investiture of bishops and abbots must be under the authority of the pope and at the hand of his representatives, without interference from the lay aristocracy.

The Cluniac reformers therefore condemned both the crime of simony, the purchase of church office, and also the assignment of a person to church office by lay, rather than ecclesiastical, hands. Such objectives called for nothing less than the complete revamping of the whole system of successions and appointments in the church, and brought under challenge all the manifold political involvements that held churchmen in their grip. Involved also was the handling of the vast, widely dispersed, and oftentimes feudally held properties of the church, which, it is estimated, amounted in the 11th century to about one third of the landed wealth of Western Europe. In short, the Cluniac reform was tantamount to a revolution.

Despite the widespread influence of the Cluniac reform, gross abuses which grew ever more flagrant in the church led loyal churchmen to engage in persistent efforts to secure a genuine and thorough reformation. Later, it was the persistence of abuses that convinced Martin Luther, as it had Wyclif, Hus, Jerome, and others before him, that the papacy held no divine mandate to rule the lives and consciences of men.

The Investiture Controversy.—The battle between church and state, along the lines laid down by the Cluniacs, is known as the Investiture controversy. Henry III (1039–1056), Holy Roman emperor, was very active in seeking to lift church life to a higher level. He was able to come to terms with, or to dominate, the powerful German nobles, as well as to keep the peace in Italy. He took definite steps to reform the church, and put some of his German churchmen on the throne in Rome as popes. He did not oppose the Cluniac reform, perhaps not discerning its challenge to royal and ducal power.

His son, later Henry IV, was only five years old when Henry III died in the year 1056. The imperial rule was left in the hands of regents, the queen, and some of the German nobility. For a while Henry IV was under his mother's tutelage, but later became the ward of two politically powerful archbishops of Germany. Accordingly, he probably knew far more about political machinations than he did of the finer things of life when he was declared king of Germany at the age of 15. This took place in 1066, the very same year that William the Conqueror crossed the English Channel under papal encouragement and overthrew the last of the Saxon kings of England. The powerful German nobles were restless under the boy king, and from the very beginning of his active reign Henry's problem was to keep these unruly nobles of the empire under some kind of control. He

naturally sought to place his friends in positions of power, and of course desired to have his supporters installed in high church office. He therefore made appointments, both lay and ecclesiastical, as he had opportunity, of a sort to strengthen his political hand. This was quite in line with what had been done for decades, indeed for centuries, but it was contrary to the program of the increasingly powerful Cluniac reformers.

The reform movement became of greater significance when papal officers took a hand in it. Prominent among these was a deacon in the city of Rome, Hildebrand, a Lombard of wide vision, tenacious will, and a remarkable dedication to what he conceived to be the interests of the church. He was a whole-hearted supporter of the Cluniac reform, and may indeed have spent a little time in the monastery at Cluny. Hildebrand, as deacon, worked with the reigning popes to strengthen the church in every way, and undoubtedly was an active agent in papal manipulations for a number of years before his appointment as pope. It was while he was deacon that the election of popes by the college of cardinals was instituted as a substitute for the previous disorderly method of election by acclaim of the people. This was a major triumph of the Cluniacs.

Hildebrand's election as Pope Gregory VII took place in the year 1073, when Henry IV, a young man of only 22 years, was actively working to consolidate his hold upon the empire. The new pope addressed himself in a kindly way to the young king, with the obvious hope that the latter would look to him as a father and adviser. But this friendly relationship gradually deteriorated. Henry was not willing for the pope to dictate who should occupy the German bishoprics, and eventually he defied the pope. As a result Pope Gregory excommunicated Henry. Applying the ban to Henry meant, of course, that all the German nobles and bishops who were opposed to the young king's program would use the excommunication as an excuse for repudiating him as king and setting up another in his stead.

Out of this combination of circumstances arose the famous incident at Canossa, at this late day difficult to analyze and evaluate. The excommunication had been issued in the fall of 1076. Henry, realizing the threat of the ban to his whole future career, set off across the Alps in the dead of winter, accompanied by two German bishops, hoping to come to some sort of terms with Gregory. In the meantime Gregory had started for Germany, where the nobles had requested him to come to arrange for the election of a new king. Gregory had traveled as far as the Tuscan castle of Canossa when Henry arrived asking for an audience. The pope was much perplexed as to what to do or say. He felt that Henry was unfit for the rulership, and knew that he now had the opportunity to displace him. On the other hand, if Henry was sincerely penitent, it was the pope's duty to absolve him. In his perplexity, Gregory kept Henry waiting three days outside the castle gates in the cold of January. Finally he gave the penitent Henry audience, and when Henry knelt before him Gregory absolved him.

Evidently realizing that to continue to Germany at this time would be useless in view of the turn of events, Gregory returned to Rome. Henry went back to Germany, carried his current conflict with the nobles to a successful conclusion, and re-established himself as king. His was a troubled reign, however, and he never made real peace with Gregory. Indeed, a little while before Gregory died Henry drove him from the city of Rome and installed in his place an antipope who, in turn, crowned Henry emperor. Gregory died in exile. He is quoted as saying, "I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile."

Henry IV's son, Henry V, carried on the Investiture struggle, but eventually, in the year 1122, a compromise was reached, known as the Concordat of Worms. By the terms of the agreement the pope of Rome, or his agent, was to appoint bishops to vacancies, with the approval of the king concerned. A legate of the pope was to invest the bishop with his ecclesiastical authority and insignia, while an agent of the emperor invested the bishop with his secular powers. This was only a compromise, and was not satisfactory except as a temporary means to an unquiet peace. As a matter of fact, serious struggles continued between the church and the state. The question was broader than whether the church should be free from the state. The church, because it represented the spiritual side, claimed to hold a superior authority, as speaking for God. It was a question, therefore, whether the church should dominate the state, or whether the two should work side by side, with the church continuing to own vast material resources and thereby to wield tremendous political influence. Logically, what actually happened was that when the rulers were weak and the papacy strong, the church dominated, and when the reverse was true the secular arm was able to wield the greater power. Both church and state suffered in consequence, as did the peace and progress of Western Europe.

Though at different periods of history the Holy Roman Empire included various areas of Western Europe, its center of gravity was always north of the Alps, in the German states. The political rivalry between pope and emperor that constituted the theme of the Investiture controversy also contributed in a major way to the success of the Reformation in that many of the German princes, from political as well as religious motives, proved to be ardent and effective sponsors of the great revolt against Rome.

The Crusades.—The ostensible reason for the Crusades was to rescue Palestine from the Moslems. Constantine had been concerned with preserving the holy spots in the land of ancient Israel, and Charlemagne had done what he could to protect the sacred sites in that revered land, which had been overrun by Islam only a few years before his reign.

The Arabian wave of the Moslem invasion had practically spent itself by the opening of the 10th century. But the 11th century saw the influx of a different breed of men. From the farther east came wave after wave of Seljuk Turks. These Turkish hordes, coming in touch with Islam, had accepted that religion with extreme fervor. They swept over ancient Persia and the Mesopotamian valley, then moved across Asia Minor (now modern Turkey) which had not before this fallen into Moslem hands. Thus the Turks were virtually at the gates of Constantinople. This occurred in 1071. About this same time the Seljuk Turks swept into Palestine and took Jerusalem.

The Eastern Roman emperor appealed to the West for help. Pope Gregory began to plan for a relief force. But, of course, aid for the Eastern empire was by no means Pope Gregory's only motive. The 11th century had seen pilgrimages increasing to the holy places of Palestine; however, the coming of the Seljuk Turks had interfered with these enterprises.

But Henry IV kept Gregory occupied, and it was not until 1095 that anything definite was done. In that year Pope Urban called a council at Clermont in France. The East was pressing for help. The Turkish leaders had begun to quarrel among themselves. Pilgrimages were being interfered with more and more. Besides, Western commerce with the East was suffering. There was another problem, too, that the pope must solve. There had been no respite in the petty wars among the feudal nobles of Western Europe. Blood was flowing, and castles and towns were being destroyed, with an accompanying

disturbance of the countryside and of agriculture. At Clermont the pope frankly appealed to the nobility of Western Europe to cease fighting among themselves and to turn their martial energies to the nobler objectives of freeing the holy places of Palestine from the Moslems. The idea took hold with almost fanatical energy. "It is the will of God," the multitude cried.

The crusade originating at Clermont was the first, and in many ways the most successful. It was not a king's crusade. Lesser nobles led the large companies of knights who united as an army to recover the holy places of Palestine. Thousands of the fighting men of Europe took the cross, met at agreed assembly points, and moved eastward over one road or another. As they passed through or near Constantinople they received the welcome of the emperor there, and having formed their armies, proceeded eastward into Asia Minor, where they defeated the Turks. They then turned southward into Syria, taking city after city on their way. Finally the crusaders reached the city of Jerusalem. That city was taken from the Moslem forces in 1099, after a short and bloody siege, and the enemy was put to the sword, with little mercy. Eventually a Kingdom of Jerusalem was established, which was maintained for nearly 100 years. Indeed, three principalities were set up in the ancient Syrian lands. The Frankish principalities of the East were, of course, organized on a feudal basis, and all the ruling nobles took an oath of fealty to the emperor Michael of Constantinople—a cause of future trouble.

Half a century later, after the Turks retook some of the territory they had lost, the Second Crusade was organized under the fervent preaching of the famous churchman, Bernard of Clairvaux. The Second Crusade was a king's crusade, with Louis VII of France and Conrad III of Germany taking the cross. This crusade, begun in 1147, had collapsed by 1148.

A generation later there arose in Egypt a great Saracen leader, Saladin. Saladin was himself a chivalric knight of Islam, but when aroused by a truce violation perpetrated by the Franks of Jerusalem, Saladin set out on a *jihad*, or holy war, against the crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem. After a short siege, Jerusalem was again in the hands of the Moslems, in the autumn of 1187. The immediate result was the declaring of the Third Crusade. This crusade (1189–1192) was unique in that it was fostered by the approval of a great church council, and was the result of a strong feeling in Europe that, by allowing Jerusalem to fall again into the hands of the infidel, God was punishing Western Europe for its sins. The emperor Frederick Barbarossa led eastward a large force of German knights, who were, however, almost all destroyed in lost battles following the accidental drowning of the emperor in eastern Asia Minor. Richard I of England and Philip Augustus of France led important contingents in the crusade, and various places in Palestine were laid under siege. However, in spite of the eminence of the leadership and the careful organization of the crusade, it accomplished very little. Most of the three years spent by the kings in Palestine was consumed in an alteration of petty fighting and truces with Saladin, the outcome of which was the recognition of mutual rights shared in certain cities of Palestine, and of the privilege of Christians to make pilgrimages to the holy places of Jerusalem. Jerusalem remained, however, in the hands of Saladin.

The Fourth Crusade, which followed quickly after the third, was the most successful of all the crusades except the first, in terms of the objective to which it was diverted, and also the most disgraceful. Planned and financed by the powerful merchant republic of Venice, the crusade was diverted from a legitimate objective in Palestine to an attack on

another Christian state, the Eastern Roman Empire, at Constantinople. It did its work during the early years of Pope Innocent III (1198–1216), one of the most intelligent and most powerful of the popes. That the pope knew the Fourth Crusade would finally make an attack upon Constantinople cannot be doubted. That he ever gave his consent cannot be certainly known. But in 1204 the Western armies took Constantinople, which the Turks had been unable to do, and the Greek Roman Empire became, for a time, a Latin kingdom. There were other crusades later, all virtual failures, but none so despicable as this. It brought to the West no real gains, and so weakened the already enfeebled Eastern Empire that 250 years later, in 1453, Constantinople, the last Christian bastion in the East, fell into the hands of its Islamic foes, this time the Ottoman Turks, and Constantinople became the capital of Islam.

The High Tide of Papal Power.—Innocent III engaged in politics in other ways than the Crusades. King Frederick Barbarossa was succeeded by his son Henry VI, married to Constance, heiress of the kingdom of Sicily, which the Normans in southern Italy had rescued from the Saracens. This meant that all of Germany and Italy were now united under the Holy Roman Empire, a mighty empire awaiting the rule of Henry's infant son, Frederick II. Henry VI soon died, and there followed a struggle for the throne between Henry's brother Philip and Otto, a German noble. Pope Innocent III held the balance of power in this contest, and was indeed himself virtually emperor. Eventually Otto was the acknowledged ruler. Later Frederick II became emperor, and carried on a running battle with a succession of popes until he died in 1250. The struggle for power weakened both the empire and the papacy.

Innocent III did more than dominate the Holy Roman Empire. He compelled King Alfonso IX of Leon to straighten out his marital affairs, under pain of excommunication. He brought to heel defiant King Philip Augustus of France. He directed papal wrath upon King John of England, and actually received from John the realm of England as a grant, then turned it back to him as a feudal fief of the papacy. This was the John from whom the English barons exacted at Runnymede, in 1215, the famous Magna Charta, the first provision of which is that the Church of England shall be free. Innocent III also contributed to the theological development of the Roman Church, and it was at his demand that the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215, voted the doctrine of transubstantiation as a dogma of the church.

In 1208 Innocent III authorized and blessed a bloody crusade against the Albigenses of southern France, where culture, literature, and the arts, as well as independent religious growth, had reached exceptional heights. As a result they were stamped out without mercy.

V. The Late Middle Ages (A.D. 1216–1517)

The Inquisition.—There grew out of this and out of the doctrinal disunity, with the accompanying emergence of dissenting sects, the intolerant, persecuting institution known as the Holy Office of the Inquisition. Throughout the preceding centuries the detection of heretics had been the responsibility of the bishops, each one of whom was supposed to function as an episcopal inquisitorial court. But the work had been done indifferently, and heresy, schism, and sectarian division were making almost a mockery out of the unity that the church had always envisioned and vociferously claimed.

Hence the papal Inquisition was devised to supplant the episcopal function. Stimulated by crusading zeal, challenged by such defiant sectarianism as the Albigenses

demonstrated, and given an example by the authoritarian discipline of the great Innocent III, a later pope formally established, in 1229, the Holy Office of the Inquisition. This instrument of torture and hatred hounded any whom the church suspected of heresy, and turned them over, when convicted, to the state to be punished by imprisonment or burning at the stake.

The Revival of Learning.—This dark period of persecution was, strangely, also a period of intellectual enlightenment. Much of this came from Islam, which contributed immeasurably to the intellectual rebirth of Western Europe. With the collapse of Western Roman imperial government in the middle of the 5th century, coinciding with the influx of the intelligent but unlearned barbarians, Western culture went into an eclipse paralleling the economic collapse that then took place. Western Christendom lived for centuries in crude and superstitious ignorance, relieved only temporarily and superficially by a revival of learning in the era of Charlemagne. Accordingly the centuries extending from the middle of the 5th to the middle of the 10th century are sometimes referred to as the intellectual Dark Ages. Dark they were, spiritually and morally as well as culturally. The term Dark Ages is extended by some to include the succeeding centuries up to the time of the Reformation, because of the crushing of dissent and religious freedom during that time by the papacy. This was spiritually a dark time, indeed. But thus to extend the application of the term is to disregard the great revivals of learning that took place after the 10th century.

There were several revivals culture, some general, some local. Of these, the upsurge of intellectual interest in the 12th century was an outstanding precursor of the wide-reaching humanistic Renaissance of the 14th and 15th centuries, which prepared the way for the Reformation.

The sources of the revival of learning were four: (1) the natural fertility of the Western European mind; (2) the small stream of Greco-Latin culture which the Roman Catholic clergy had quietly kept flowing, mainly in the monasteries; (3) a trickle of Greek learning provided by scholars fleeing from the invasion of the Ottoman Turks; (4) but chiefly, Islamic sources. When the Arabs conquered Eastern Rome and North Africa, they were culturally hungry, and were amazed at the wealth of Greco-Roman and Persian culture that came to their hands. They took it over, gave it new life, adapted it to their Arabic and Islamic ways of thought, and made it their own. The result was a brilliant Islamic civilization, centering chiefly at Baghdad on the Euphrates and at Cordova in Spain. The Jews, who had much in common with the Arabs, contributed also.

This Moslem culture the Christian peoples of Western Europe at first viewed with suspicion, as if it were a sort of magic. But gradually, through Spain and by way of the early crusades, it reached the Western mind. A revived Greco-Roman education was provided the West in an Islamic dress. The mathematical, medical, and scientific knowledge the West thus gained was large and practical, but it was the transference to the West of ancient philosophy, chiefly Aristotelian, that aroused Western Christendom and even affected Roman Catholic theology. This intellectual revival culminated in the great Renaissance, or rebirth of learning, of the 14th and 15th centuries. By stimulating men to think for themselves, by demonstrating that the Roman Catholic Church was far from being the sole custodian of knowledge, and by leading devout men to study the Scriptures in their original languages, the Renaissance made an inestimable contribution to the Reformation.

Papal Decline and Schism.—A century after the time of Innocent III it was evident that the papacy had entered a period of decline that seemed to presage its death. Pope Boniface VIII (1294–1303) came to the throne at a time when nations, with the virility of a fresh nationalism pushing them on, were facing each other across the boundaries of Europe. England and France were fighting recurring wars over English feudal holdings in France, and a strong king of France was again defying a pope, this time by seeking to tax the clergy. Pope Boniface VIII endeavored to deal with kings as Innocent III had done, but the times and personalities were not the same, and he failed. The result was that succeeding popes were dominated by a strong France, and from 1305 to 1378 the popes were Frenchmen, ruling a truncated Roman Church from a tiny papal feudal holding, Avignon, in southern France. During this era, known in church history as the Babylonian captivity, the city of Rome shrank to the size of a small town, with an estimated population at one time of less than 20,000.

The Babylonian captivity of the papacy ended in an even worse perplexity for the papacy and for Europe. A pope was elected, pledged to rule from Rome, and he did. But another, a French pope insisted on reigning from Avignon. Two popes were now ruling what Boniface VIII had 75 years before proudly called “one holy church”! The division that resulted is called the Great Schism. When the Council of Pisa sought in 1409 to heal the schism by electing a pope and deposing all rival popes, it only made matters still worse, for now three popes pretended to have right to the chair of St. Peter. The situation was at last resolved by the Council of Constance (1414–17), which was able to achieve the unseating of the three rival popes and the election of one single pontiff. Another accomplishment of the Council of Constance was to order the burning of the two Czech reformers, Hus and Jerome. This the servants of the emperor did in spite of an imperial safe-conduct previously issued. After this the papacy was held by men far more concerned with the humanistic arts and literature that the Renaissance was fostering, than with the salvation of men or the welfare of the church. Only the adverse challenge of the Reformation brought to the pontifical throne popes with some sense of spiritual responsibility. The Babylonian captivity of the church and the Great Schism unmasked the weakness and corruption of the church for all of Western Europe to see, and thus prepared the way for the momentous Reformation which followed in the 16th century.

New Religious Orders.—Reference has been made to the influence of the Cluniac monastic system and of the reform it fostered. The monastic system continued, however, to become increasingly corrupt, until the people distrusted and disliked monks and felt that the church cared for nothing but wealth.

In the 12th century many reform movements rose, teaching voluntary poverty and a return to a pure and simple life, and denouncing not only the practices but also many of the doctrines of the church (see the next section). Some were preaching without church authorization and distributing the Scriptures in the vernacular instead of in the official Latin version.

The church’s reaction to most of those in these groups, early in the 13th century, was not only to excommunicate them as heretics but also to prohibit the translation and use of the Bible in the vernacular, to punish the dissenters, and in some cases, to mount a crusade of extermination (i.e., the Albigenses in France). Another reaction was the founding of new orders within the church to combat heresy, using the same tactics of

itinerant preaching and working among the people to convert or confound the heretics, to instruct the faithful, and to help the needy.

A new kind of religious order evolved early in the 13th century, which devoted itself to public preaching, and did not confine itself to monastery buildings. In Southern France a man named Dominic, from Old Castile, had seen the pious and peaceable lives of the Albigenses, and appealed to friends of his to join him in living equally good lives within the church and for the benefit of the church. His proposal was approved by the pope, and the Dominican order was born. This order gave much of its attention to education and took over, quite largely, the work of the Inquisition.

At about the same time a young Italian, Francis of Assisi, son of a wealthy merchant, distracted by the enormous wealth of the church and attracted by the monks' vows of poverty, decided to give up his claim upon the family wealth, renounce his social position, and devote himself to a humble life of service to the poor and needy. He invited the pope, bishops, and wealthy nonchurchmen to join him in his self-abnegation.

The idea that the church should give up all its material possessions, as a cure for all its own ills and a solution of its difficulties with the state and with feudal society, was not new. Emperor Henry V had proposed this very thing to the papacy, but the pope had then rejected it, as the pope now rejected Francis' suggestion. Francis came near to separating from the worldly church he sought to correct, thus earning its wrath. Later (1498), Savonarola of Florence was tortured, hanged, and burned for somewhat similar efforts at reform. However, Francis stayed in the church, and with the pope's approval established the order of St. Francis, to serve outside the confines of a monastery, though under monastic rules, and to devote itself to works of goodness and charity.

The Dissenting Reform Movements.—The idea of voluntary poverty for Christ's sake and the attempt to restore the simple, pure Christianity of the New Testament had far-reaching consequences. Several 12th-century "Poor Men" groups, such as the followers of Arnold of Brescia (c. 1100–1155) and Peter Waldo of Lyons (c. 1173), ended in challenging the whole papal system and in some cases calling the church Babylon and the pope Antichrist.

All of these movements were actually part of a ferment of dissent that had, for centuries, been challenging the boasted unity of the church. There were the Patarines of northern Italy (c. 1056), who attacked the immorality of the clergy. There were the Passagians, a strange sect that wandered over Lombardy admonishing men and women to hold to the true gospel. There were the Sabbatati, whose singular custom of wearing wooden shoes (*sabots*) with the symbol of the cross was a sectarian sign. There were the Cathari, literally, "the pure," (related to the dualistic Bogomils of the East) who were in Lombardy in the 11th century and spread over Western Europe, of whom the group in Southern France was known as the Albigenses. Though some of these were partly heretical in doctrine, their purity of life aroused the admiration of the people and the wrath of the loose-living ecclesiastics. The Albigenses were stamped out by a crusade in 1208.

Most prominent of the dissenters, and surviving still in Northern Italy, were the Waldenses, or Waldensians. When Peter Waldo and his followers were exiled from Lyons, they went into Lombardy, in Northern Italy, mingled with older groups there, and nurtured seeds of dissent already sown. These French-Italian Waldensians spread to Switzerland, Germany, Austria, Bohemia, Moravia, and other parts of Europe. Their

early teachings, known from the writings of their Catholic opponents, were admitted to be orthodox, that is, in harmony with the Apostles' Creed, but their disregard of the authority of the church caused them to be classed as heretics. Persecution gradually reduced them to the present remnant in the mountains of Northern Italy, west of Turin.

They had "barbes," or pastors, serving groups of congregations and traveling about as missionaries and overseers. They had a communion service simpler than the mass, though they varied on the doctrine of transubstantiation. Noted for their faith in the Bible as the Word of God, they distributed manuscript copies of the Scriptures in the vernacular. Waldensians rejected the invocation of Mary and the saints, disparaged many of the rituals, denounced oaths and the death penalty, and ignored papal prohibition of their preaching. Some rejected purgatory. They disregarded holy days of the Catholics, though most of them observed Sunday. The Waldensians hailed with joy the beginnings of the Reformation, and joined hands with the Protestants of France and Switzerland. This brought their worst persecution, from French and Italian rulers, during a hundred years and more, until finally they were granted religious freedom by the Duke of Savoy in 1694. Today the Waldensians form part of the Presbyterian family of churches.

In the latter part of the 14th century in Prague, Moravia, Hus and Jerome began to teach reforming doctrines. This activity cost them their lives, but gave birth to the Utraquist (communion in both kinds) and Taborite reform movements, and the "Unitas Fratrum," or Bohemian Brethren, or Czech Brethren. These groups bade fair to sweep nearly all the Czechs, Moravians, and Slovaks into their fold. Bitter warfare waged against them by imperial armies was not able to quench the evangelical fires they started. In the 15th century the Netherlands was stirred; the Brethren of the Common Life, a semimonastic movement of men of a contemplative and pietistic spirit, began to talk in a new way of faith and the gospel.

All these reform movements, inside and outside the church, attempted, in varying degrees, to restore an evangelical type of Christianity. The fuel of reform was laid. It remained only for the sparks to fall from a chosen personality, under the right circumstances, for the fires of a great spiritual awakening to burn. The minds and souls of men were awaiting the release that the Lutheran Reformation was to bring.

Bibliography

- ADENEY, WALTER F. *The Greek and Eastern Churches*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908.
- ALLEN, ALEXANDER V. G. *Christian Institutions*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916.
- BAINTON, ROLAND H. *The Medieval Church*. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1962.
- BEET, WILLIAM EARNEST. *The Medieval Papacy and Other Essays*. London: C. H. Kelly, 1914.
- BRYCE, JAMES. *The Holy Roman Empire*. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1894.
- The Cambridge Medieval History*. Edited by H. M. Gwatkin, J. P. Whitney, and others. 8 vols. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1926–36.
- COULTON, G. G., ed. *Life in the Middle Ages*. Selected, translated, and annotated by G. G. Coulton. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931.
- DEANESLY, MARGARET. *A History of the Medieval Church, 590–1500*. 9th ed. London: Methuen, 1969.
- EMERTON, EPHRAIM. *The Beginnings of Modern Europe (1250–1450)*. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1917.
- _____. *An Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages (375–814)*. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1898.
- _____. *Mediaeval Europe (814–1300)*. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1894.
- GIBBON, EDWARD. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Edited by J. B. Bury. 7 vols. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1896–1900.
- HARNACK, ADOLF. *History of Dogma*. Translated from the 3d German ed. 7 vols. London: Williams & Norgate, 1896–99.

- HEFELE, CHARLES JOSEPH. *History of the Councils of the Church*. From the Original Documents. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1872–96.
- HODGKIN, THOMAS. *Italy and Her Invaders*. 4 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1892–96.
- JACKSON, F. J. FOAKES. *An Introduction to the History of Christianity, A.D. 590–1314*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921.
- KNOWLES, DAVID, AND DIMITRI BOLENSKY. *The Middle Ages*. The Christian Centuries, vol. 2. New York: Paulist Press, 1978.
- KRUGER, GUSTAV. *The Papacy, The Idea and Its Exponents*. Translated by F. M. S. Batchelor and C. A. Miles. London: T. F. Unwin, 1909.
- LAGARDE, ANDRÉ. See Turmel, Joseph.
- LEA, HENRY CHARLES. *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*. 3 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1888.
- OMAN, CHARLES W. C. *The Dark Ages 476–918*. London: Rivingtons, 1901.
- PAETOW, LOUIS JOHN. *A Guide to the Study of Medieval History*. Rev. ed. New York: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1931.
- PIRENNE, HENRI. *Medieval Cities; Their Origins and the Revival of Trade*. Translated from the French by Frank D. Halsey. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1925.
- SCHAFF, PHILIP. *History of the Christian Church*. 7 vols. in 8. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1882–1910. [Vol. 5, pts. 1, 2, by David Schley Schaff, 1907–10.]
- SHOTWELL, JAMES T., and LOOMIS, LOUISE ROPES. *The See of Peter*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1927.
- SOUTHERN, RICHARD W. *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1970.
- THATCHER, OLIVER J., and MCNEAL, EDGAR H. *A Source Book for Mediaeval History*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.
- THOMPSON, JAMES WESTFALL. *Feudal Germany*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1928.
- THOMPSON, ROBERT ELLIS. *The Historic Episcopate*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1910.
- [TURMEL, JOSEPH.] *The Latin Church in the Middle Ages*, by André Lagarde [pseud.]. Translated by Archibald Alexander. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915.
- WALKER, G. S. M. *The Growing Storm*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1961.

The Reformation and Onward

I. Conditions Before the Reformation

In the Middle Ages the church pervaded every domain: state and society, science and business, literature and the arts. It claimed that its power went even beyond the grave and that it could open or close the gates of heaven. The layman was born into the church. To be a citizen meant to be a church member.

From the 6th century through the 12th the papacy had gradually (and not without setbacks) become the most centralized power in Western Christendom, reaching its peak in the 13th century; but in the following centuries there appeared increasing signs of decline (see the preceding article, also Additional Note on Dan. 7 in Vol. IV). The people were spiritually undernourished, and doubt and confusion increased. Greek philosophy and pagan thought permeated theology, and controversies arose. Many popes were more interested in wars or the fine arts than in their duties as spiritual leaders. These trends, it is true, were opposed by certain leaders and thinkers such as the mystic, Bernard of Clairvaux.

Attempts to Reform the Church.—The papacy, which Bernard of Clairvaux and other mystics desired to be essentially religious, was itself a cause of disunity. The popes had found many and devious means of enriching the coffers of the church; simony had greatly increased. One after another, lucrative offices were created and offered for sale to the highest bidder, by a church that had become almost wholly mercenary-minded.

Moreover, the popes imposed themselves as the arbiters of kings and called for political differences to be submitted to them for arbitration. The controversies of the

popes with secular powers brought the papacy to embarrassing division, with three popes finally claiming Peter's chair (see page 37, under "Papal Decline and Schism"). Church councils were able to resolve the problem as to papal succession, but not the more basic one of moral reformation. For seventeen years the Council of Basel, convened in 1431, attempted, unsuccessfully, to reform the abuses of the church, which had drifted into utter moral bankruptcy, a fact which a majority of churchmen acknowledged and deplored.

John Wyclif (c. 1320–1384).—Events on the Continent had their repercussion in England, where the constant interference of the pope in national affairs was deeply resented. The dissatisfaction of England was especially voiced by John Wyclif, who was trained at Oxford and later taught there. Oxford eventually became the citadel of Wyclif's reformatory movement. At first he gained a reputation as a speculative philosopher, and later as a leader in the field of ecclesiastical politics. In the 1370's he launched a movement whose objective was to reform the abuses in the church.

When, in 1365, the pope assessed England for back dues for thirty-three years, Wyclif became his country's champion in opposing the claim. He argued that England had the right not only to disregard Pope Urban V's claim but to be reimbursed for funds that had been wrongly administered by the church, and that, furthermore, England should take the initiative in imposing certain reforms on the church.

While at Oxford, Wyclif mentioned on various occasions, especially in his *Sermones*, the great impression made on him by the reading of the Bible, and how his eyes were thereby opened to the condition of the church. Most of his ideas are set forth in his *Summa Theologiae*, and more especially in his *De Civili Dominio* ("On Civil Government"). He strongly protested against the Avignonese system of exactions and declared that the church must not function as a temporal dominion.

Wyclif had the temperament and courage of a reformer. He attacked the doctrine of transubstantiation and proclaimed the sole authority of the Scriptures. But it was his concept of the church itself that was most effective in arousing the pope to plot his removal as a critic of papal policy. The financial situation in the church convinced Wyclif that it should seek poverty rather than power. His ideas coincided with similar trends on the Continent, where poverty was considered a virtue, and wealth, particularly money, the "root of all evil." The less the church had to do with money, he declared, the better off she would be spiritually. Like Wyclif, the Franciscans, the Spirituals, the Waldenses, and the Brethren of the Common Life considered wealth to be the cause of corruption.

Wyclif defined the church as the community of those who are predestined to blessedness; none who are eternally lost have any part in it. There is but one universal church, and Christ is its head. The church continues to exist even if it has no visible head. Yet there should be human leadership, of the right kind, and the right leader is not one chosen by cardinals but one "elected" by God. If an elector is himself not among the elect, Wyclif warned, then he may choose a false leader, an antichrist. The true leader is one whose teachings and life most nearly follow Christ, whose rule is not of this world. These ideas concerning the church are stressed in the last chapters of the *Summa*, entitled "On Simony," "On Apostasy," and "On Blasphemy."

Wyclif translated the New Testament into English on the basis of the Vulgate; the Old Testament translation was the work of Nicholas of Hereford. Wyclif organized a popular movement of evangelism, sending priests and laymen two by two, barefoot, and bound by no vows, to preach in all sections of England. These emissaries, the Lollards as they were

referred to in the Bull of Gregory IX, survived Wyclif and laid the foundation for the later English Reformation. “Every learned man that you meet is a Lollard,” said a contemporary. The Wyclifites were often called Bible men.

John Hus (1369–1415).—The influence of Wyclif went far beyond his own country. It was particularly strong in Bohemia. The most faithful of Wyclif’s disciples was John Hus, who followed Wyclif’s teachings almost literally. Hus was a learned man, a professor at the University of Prague, an eloquent preacher, and an ardent patriot. Like Wyclif, he was determined to reform the church, particularly the morals of the clergy. He likewise wrote an essay on the functions of the true church. In the disputation of 1412 on indulgences he quoted from Wyclif’s *De Ecclesia*. When Pope John XXIII (later omitted from the lists as a false pope) offered full indulgence to all who would fight against the king of Naples, Hus protested vehemently. The church, he argued, must not engage in warfare. Moreover, the pope had no right to sell the forgiveness of sin. Here again, his sermons are an exact reproduction of Wyclif’s.

Condemned by the pope, Hus stated that God was his protector, the only head of the church. When called before the Council of Constance in 1415, Hus went with an imperial safe conduct, but he refused to retract his alleged “errors” unless they were proved false by Scripture. “I cannot,” he said, “without lying to my conscience, consider that I have committed the errors of which I am accused.”

Like Wyclif, Hus proclaimed the Bible to be sole authority in matters of faith, the church to be made up of true believers, the elect, and the pope not to be infallible. Hus was branded a dangerous heretic and burned alive in 1415.

Girolamo Savonarola (1452–1498).—Though Dante referred to Italy as “an abode of sorrows,” others considered it a vast playground. The pope turned against medieval asceticism and was drawn into a turmoil of festivities; some priests, such as Ficino, turned to pagan literature, feeling that the church was unable to offer them solace or salvation. The worsening of moral conditions went hand in hand with the glorification of paganism. In Florence, where the Médicis were in command and had suppressed civil liberties, a Dominican preacher of the convent of San Marco, Girolamo (Jerome) Savonarola, became convinced that he had been ordained by God to denounce the corruption and tyranny of the church and its degenerate leaders. He predicted that God would punish the church unless it repented. Greatly under his influence for some time, the people of Florence ousted the Médicis and endorsed a reform in morals, the punishment of blasphemy, and the destruction of all implements that were used in amusements or gambling. The pope’s attempt to appease Savonarola by offering him a cardinal’s hat only increased his reforming fervor.

Preaching fearless sermons inspired by the messages of Bible prophets, Savonarola insisted on salvation through Christ alone and not by meritorious works. “When the entire ecclesiastical power is corrupt,” he cried, “it is necessary to go to Christ who is the first cause and say to Him: Thou art my Confessor, my Bishop and my Pope” (trans. from Eugene Choisy, *Histoire Générale du Christianisme* [4th ed.], p. 80).

Savonarola was very widely opposed—by the young noblemen, by the Franciscan order, by the defenders of the Médici, and especially by Pope Alexander VI, a Borgia. Abandoned by some of his supporters, Savonarola was accused of being a false prophet and a heretic, and was strangled and then burned at the stake in 1498, upon orders of Pope Alexander. The pontiff was particularly annoyed by his attacks on the see of Rome

and by his demand for a church council that would dismiss the pope as impious and corrupt.

II. The World on the Eve of the Reformation

1

A new world slowly came into existence about the year 1500. The transition between the medieval world and the modern age was gradual and generally imperceptible. The forces that had in large measure lain dormant preceding the Reformation period became apparent and asserted themselves with urgency and force.

The greatest menace to the West for more than 800 years had been the Moslem pressure. The Moors had taken over Spain, and the Turks later pushed from the East ever closer to the heart of Europe. In Reformation lands the Moslem peril was particularly felt. For a time Luther was so impressed by the Turkish threat that on various occasions he preached crusading sermons against the Turks, and feared that the end of the world would come before he could complete his translation of the Old Testament into German.

Among the more significant conditions that developed in Western Europe about the beginning of the 16th century are the following.

Emergence of Nationalism.—Strong, centralized states arose and threatened both the more or less unchallenged international power asserted by the papacy during the Middle Ages, and the sway of the Holy Roman Empire in Central Europe. Independent nations gradually evolved into absolute monarchies, which form of government eventually became the pattern for all of Western Europe.

Spain was dominant during the 16th century. Gaining enormous wealth from the New World, she, with her rapidly increasing sea power, posed a major challenge to other nations. France, where strong Protestant parties existed within the body politic, was drawn into a series of bloody civil-religious wars. Eventually the first Bourbon king, a former Huguenot, Henry IV of Navarre, set France on a course of expansion and colonialism that led, in the following century, to the royal absolutism of Louis XIV and to the hegemony of France on the Continent.

England became nationally conscious in the 16th century when, under the Tudors, the country expanded, independent of papal interference, and started on its own way as a nation, eventually gaining over Spain and Holland the mastery of the seas and developing a vast colonial empire. This irresistible trend toward individual nationalism is not unrelated to the religious Reformation.

In the 16th century religion was the major issue of the day. The great sovereigns of Europe had to face this issue, which affected the course of events in their realms. In England, Henry VIII (1509–1547) came into conflict with Rome. In France, Francis I (1515–1547) constantly vacillated between Protestant and Catholic influences, depending on the way the political wind was blowing. When the king needed the alliance or support of the Lutheran princes in Germany in the struggle against Charles V, a mild form of Protestantism was temporarily permitted in France. Charles V (1519–1556), head of the Holy Roman Empire, emperor of Austria, and sovereign of the German States, was the

¹Nichol, F. D. (1978). *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary : The Holy Bible with exegetical and expository comment*. Commentary Reference Series (Php 1:1). Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

most powerful ruler in Central Europe. His dominions ranged from Austria to the New World, and from the Low Countries (now Holland and Belgium) to Spain and Italy.

The Reformation was directly influenced and advanced by this political pattern, for the ambitions of the Austrian emperor and of the king of France resulted in a constant state of war between the two sovereigns. This situation repeatedly diverted the attention of Charles V from his lifelong purpose to crush the Reformation. He was a staunch Roman Catholic, anxious to maintain order and establish unity in his vast domains scattered all over the globe, and his son, Philip II of Spain, was even more fanatically Catholic.

The Opening of the Sea Routes.—With the dawning of the 16th century the horizons were enlarged and new continents were opened. Portuguese, Spanish, and Italian discoverers found sea routes to India and the East Indies, the storehouse of spices. Columbus reached the island shores of the Western world in 1492. The globe was circled for the first time in 1519–1522 by the Portuguese Magellan. At the same time the Spaniards under Cortes took possession of Mexico. Some of these adventurers were zealous for their religion. Columbus believed that the end of all things was approaching, and one of his declared motives was the conversion of the peoples of the new lands. Prince Henry the Navigator of Portugal, the “brain” of so many expeditions across the unknown seas, had a passion for the spreading of Christianity; and Magellan, whose expedition went round the world, had deep religious motives also.

Cultural Development.—The Renaissance, or rebirth, of the arts in the 15th and early 16th centuries on the pattern of the classical Greek masters consisted in the creation of new architectural styles, a revival of letters, and the fostering of the fine arts by wealthy patrons such as the Medicis of Florence, the kings, and the popes. The great Italian masters created works of art that attained an unsurpassed degree of classical beauty in painting and sculpture in Italy, Holland, and Germany, while France excelled in architecture. The 16th century was crowded with important men and ideas, some generously creative, others seditious. Adventurous, fearless men entered new lines of thought, discarding the revered concepts of the past. Artists, scholars, soldiers, and philosophers were drawn into this irresistible current. What had been a chimera became reality; what had been real disappeared. While the troubadours still sang their songs from castle to castle, feudalism was gradually fading away. The rebirth of the arts recaptured the vision of the beauty of antiquity, while the press became an effective means of propaganda. The frantic desire to be free caused some to catch the light that came from that “chasm of science” referred to by Rabelais. Even the human body lost its mysteries. While young Servetus discovered the pulmonary circulation of the blood, Rabelais, in an anatomical dissection before an interested audience at Lyons, explained the *fabricam corporis* (the fabric of the body).

Science.—Copernicus (1473–1543), a contemporary of Luther, advocated the revolutionary idea that the sun, and not the earth, is the center of the universe, and that the earth revolves around the sun, not the sun around the earth. That was heresy. The church clung to the ancient Ptolemaic theory that the earth was the center of the universe, and that all the heavenly bodies circled around it. Peter Lombard (c. 1100–c. 1160) had declared, “Just as man is made for the sake of God—that is, that he may serve Him—so the universe is made for the sake of man—that is, that it may serve him; therefore is man placed at the middle point of the universe” (Albert C. Knudson, *Present Tendencies in Religious Thought*, p. 43). Copernicus was considered a heretic by Protestants as well as

Catholics. He did not dare advocate his ideas openly, nor did Galileo (1564–1642), who also believed that the earth was rotating on its own axis while circling around the sun. For this scientific heresy Galileo was imprisoned, tried, and barely escaped execution by outwardly renouncing his scientific opinions. The medieval superstitions hung on until, after some time, men saw the light and had the courage to follow it.

The growth of science and wealth was both a challenge and a threat to Christianity. It was a threat because it increased a desire for wealth and encouraged the exploitation of new-found continents for selfish motives; the love of gold often resulted in the oppression, if not the elimination, of natives. It was also a challenge to bring Christianity to far-flung places. The Jesuits had some idea of overseas missions, but the Reformers had little concept of world evangelism; the missionary vision came later, with the Pietist sects. The new science was a threat to the Catholic Church because it aroused men to think for themselves. And there were Protestants as well as Catholics who denounced the new theory, proposed by Copernicus, that the earth moved around the sun.

Intellectual Unrest.—A revival of liberal culture and a new spirit of criticism helped to unmask certain fraudulent documents that had been used for some eight centuries to bolster the authority of the church, for example, the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals and the Donation of Constantine. The shaky foundations of the medieval systems were affected by the new thinking. The new concepts developed by Northern European humanism were rapidly diffused in the universities and through the pamphlets that came from the presses of Basel and Paris. Again, the enthusiasm for new learning was a challenge and a threat to the Christian—a challenge because it offered almost unlimited possibilities for the propagation of the gospel, in which the new inventions were an unexpected help; and a threat because of the spirit of skeptical criticism that could easily undermine the foundations of a positive Christian faith. This was evidenced in the feud between Luther and Erasmus concerning the freedom of the human will. Erasmus endorsed the idea that the will is free, while Luther argued, presumably from the Bible, that the will is in bondage. Erasmus did not ultimately command the confidence of all Protestants, and the Catholics placed his books on the Index after the Council of Trent (1545–1564).

Erasmus of Rotterdam (1466?–1536) is called the prince of humanists. His keen mind and vast knowledge contributed much to the reform movement at a certain time. Erasmus' ideal was to appeal to the consciousness of Christendom through the Sacred Writings; to that end he published (1516) the New Testament in Greek (see Vol. V, p. 141). The text was accompanied by a Latin translation, with annotations. Luther used this text in his lectures on Galatians, and it was through Erasmus' text that Luther was made aware of the inaccuracies in the Vulgate. This Greek text enabled Martin Luther to translate the New Testament in the short period of a few months. Outstanding Germans, like Reuchlin, for example, also contributed to the knowledge and the furtherance of the gospel.

In England Thomas More, the author of *Utopia*, envisioned an ideal world of happiness and social justice, whereas John Colet of Oxford sought to solve the problems of his day through education. The humanists, the intellectuals of the Reformation Era, aimed at a solution of the troubles of their age by going back to the thinking of ancient Greece and Rome. They held that man was able to contribute to his own salvation, and would be helped best by education and an enlightened leadership. Emphasis was placed on human rather than divine means of improvement.

Economic Unrest.—Another significant characteristic of this period was a great increase in wealth, resulting in part from the discovery of gold on the new-found continents and in part from improved business methods. This wealth, however, was largely controlled by a few princes, and much of the land was held by the church. In Germany, for instance, nearly one half of all land was owned by the church. In France the situation was similar. The serfs and peasants who worked the land and were attached to the soil had no freedom. To fish or to hunt on the land where they worked was forbidden, and to cut down a tree on that land could be punished by death.

The average man in Renaissance times was hungry and cold. The vast majority of the population were not able to live on their meager income. Martin Luther referred to these deplorable economic conditions in his tract of 1520 addressed *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation*. He indicated that the times had changed and that the poor could not be oppressed any longer. The peasants understood this to mean that Luther would henceforth be their spokesman and defender.

Superstitions.—A belief in the merit of works and in the miraculous power of relics was cynically endorsed and encouraged by the church. Almost every prince, certainly every church, had relics that were an important source of revenue. In Luther's day "relic religion" was rampant. Frederick the Wise, elector of Saxony, Luther's prince and friend, was a zealous collector of relics. By 1509 his collection listed 5,005 items. By 1520 it had grown to include 19,013 holy bones. Those who viewed the relics on All Saints' Day (November 1) and made the stipulated contribution might receive from the pope indulgences for the reduction of time in purgatory, either for themselves or for others, to the extent of 1,902,202 years and 270 days. In utter contempt Luther exclaimed on one occasion: "What lies there are about relics! One claims to have a feather from the wing of the angel Gabriel, and the Bishop of Mainz has a flame from Moses' burning bush. And how does it happen that eighteen apostles are buried in Germany when Christ had only twelve?" (in Roland H. Bainton, *Here I Stand*, p. 296).

Opposite the Church of St. John Lateran in Rome is the *Scala Sancta*, the 28 stairsteps which, it was supposed, had stood before Pilate's palace. He who ascended these stairs on his knees, reciting on each step a paternoster, presumably accomplished the release of a soul from purgatory.

Indulgences.—Penance was taught and practiced in the church before the Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325). It consisted in the following steps: (1) the contrition of the heart, (2) an auricular confession, (3) satisfaction by good works, and (4) absolution, or forgiveness, of sins, pronounced by the priest in the name of God. In the 8th century, in some countries, at least some of the good works could be replaced by cash donations to the church. From this came papal indulgences, first granted in the 11th century to those who, "from devotion," went on the Crusades; then to those who made certain contributions to the Crusades or, later, to various church projects. Absolution now preceded the prescription of penance. In the 13th century penance was declared a sacrament (see Vol. VI, p. 44), but it was more than a century later that the theology of indulgences was explained as payment of the debt of penance from the church's "treasury of merits," on which the pope could draw. It was held that on the penitent's confession to the priest, God forgave the *guilt* of the sins confessed and the *eternal* punishment, but that the sinner still had to bear the *temporal* punishment either in this life or in purgatory, before he could enter heaven. An indulgence was the remission of all or a part of the

temporal punishment that remained due on account of sin, after its guilt had been forgiven. It was granted on condition of penitence and the performance of prescribed good works, such as prayers or other good deeds, or giving money to the church.

The Treasury of Merit.—The martyrs, the saints, the apostles, and especially our Lord and His mother had done more than their share of good works, it was believed, and what was over and beyond the need for their own salvation had been deposited in a supposed “treasury of merit.” These surplus merits of the saints were said to be transferable to those whose accounts were in arrears. Of course, the pope, as the alleged successor of St. Peter, held the keys to this treasury of merit, and he could loose men from temporal punishment by assigning them credit from this “treasury.” The transaction was then called an indulgence. That point was discussed, later, by Luther standing before Cajetan at Augsburg in 1518.

The practical value of indulgences, therefore, was the remission or payment of penalties that were due after a person had received absolution. But half a century before Luther, Pope Sixtus IV had declared that the efficacy of indulgences extended to purgatory for the benefit of the dead “by way of suffrage” as well as for the living “by way of absolution,” not so much the remission of the debt of punishment as its payment from the church’s treasury of merits.

Undercurrents of Reformation.—Even before Martin Luther began to call for reformation of the church there existed a widespread faith among simple, pious Christians that went back to the Lollards, the Hussites, the Waldensians, and the Brethren of the Common Life, all of whom advocated the translation and circulation of the Bible and the reading of devotional literature. Many of those pre-Reformation movements were eminently mystic. The true evangelical mystics emphasized a life of prayer and meditation and access to God without the interposition of a mediating priesthood. They stressed the religion of the heart and feeling rather than that of the theologian. This intense religious devotional life was an important means of preparing the way for the Reformation in the hearts of thousands.

Generally speaking, these earlier attempts at reformation were not aimed at separation from the Catholic Church. None, in fact, had started with the aim of breaking away from the church. Many of these pre-Reformation groups continued to accept the priest and the rites of the church, but only as aids to the spiritual life. Even Martin Luther had no thought, at first, of breaking with the church. He attempted only to correct abuses. In fact, the great Reformers did not break with the church primarily because it was corrupt in practice and in teaching, but rather because the church refused to accept the principle of Holy Scripture as the basis of its teachings. The Reformers were concerned with a changed way of life, but even more with acceptance of the principle of justification by faith. The primary clash between the Reformers and the Catholic Church was on the basis of the acceptance or rejection of the great Reformation principles: (1) the Bible as the only acceptable authority for faith and practice, (2) justification by faith alone, without the merit of good works, and (3) the priesthood of all believers. When the Catholic Church refused to accept these principles, the great secession in the Western Church was inevitable.

III. The Reformation in Germany

Martin Luther’s Early Experiences.—The movements for separation from the Church of Rome and for the liberation of conscience sprang up simultaneously in various

places. The roots of Protestantism go back to the early church—to Augustine, to the Waldenses, to the mystic preachers and sects of the Middle Ages, to Wyclif and John Hus. But above all, Protestant teaching has its roots in the Bible, particularly in the epistles of Paul.

Martin Luther, foremost of all Reformers, was born at Eisleben, November 10, 1483. His parents were industrious citizens and strict in rearing their seven children. Martin was reared in a typical German Christian home. The fear of God and belief in the reality of angels and demons deeply affected him. He learned to conform closely to the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. His manner of life was that of the peasant, whose language and temperament remained with him all his life. He was sturdy, diligent, brilliantly endowed, and was considered an excellent student. His studies followed the usual medieval pattern. He attended the famous University of Erfurt, where he was trained by Occamist teachers (cf. p. 42), who were the modernists of the time. Occam had taught that Christianity cannot be demonstrated by reason but must be accepted by faith on the authority of the teachings of the church. Occam doubtless exerted some influence at the beginning of Luther's studies, but Luther later turned against these "hoggish theologians," as he called them. After obtaining his Master's degree he began to study law in harmony with his father's desires.

Two months later, in July, 1505, Luther suddenly announced his decision to become a monk. Very impressionable, he had been frightened by a bolt of lightning, and in terror of death promised St. Anne that he would become a monk if his life was spared. Although the decision was abrupt, his high-strung temperament and sensitive conscience were ready for that step. At Erfurt he had experienced an intense sense of moral guilt. This became more frequent in his later life. He entered one of the Observant Augustinian cloisters at Erfurt. It is significant that he became a disciple of Augustine, who is credited with much of Protestant theology. Luther was, as he said, more carried into the monastery than drawn into it. His friends were amazed, and his father was highly displeased, for the move deprived the latter of the fond hope that his able son might offer him security in his old age. But Martin Luther had made a vow to St. Anne, and he purposely selected an order that enforced strict discipline as this alone seemed, at the time, to promise peace of mind and the salvation of his soul.

But the monastic life brought him neither peace of soul nor conviction of having received salvation. Staupitz, the vicar-general for Germany, ordered him to study theology, and in 1507 he was ordained priest. In celebrating his first mass he was so overcome by awe at the idea of entering into the very presence of God that, as he later said, he would as soon have run away. Many months of distress of soul followed. He referred often to that anxious period in the monastery by depicting the terrors of his heart, especially when he lectured on Galatians. He fasted often, prayed with intensity, mortified his body, went to long confessions every day, yet he did not attain assurance of salvation, and eventually his anguish became unbearable.

On a visit to Rome in 1511 on business for his order he was shocked by the carelessness of the Italian clergy and the corruption of relic-ridden Rome. He ascended Pilate's staircase on his knees, saying a prayer on each step in the belief that he could thus release a soul from purgatory. Luther's son Paul heard his father refer to this staircase incident when he was eleven years old, and recalled it in 1582, thirty-six years after his father's death. The son said, writing of his father, that when Martin Luther "was

saying his prayers on the steps of the Lateran Staircase, the verse from the prophet Habakkuk entered his mind, ... 'the just shall live by faith'" (trans. from Otto Scheel, *Dokumente zu Luthers Entwicklung* [1929], p. 210).

However, Luther seems to contradict his son's later report when he recalls the staircase experience in his sermons and commentaries. His most significant statement was made in 1545 (one year before his death). Recalling this incident, he said: "In Rome I wanted to deliver my grandfather from Purgatory, and I ascended the Staircase of Pilate, reciting on each step a 'Pater Noster.' For there was a belief that he who prayed in this way would save a soul. But when I arrived at the top, I was thinking, 'Who knows if it is true?'" (*Predigten des Jahres 1545*, col. 1, 9ff., Nov. 15, 1545, WA 51, 89, trans. from Scheel, *op. cit.*, p. 197). Both recollections could be true.

Back in Germany he pursued his theological studies, as instructed to do by his superiors, but he was greatly influenced in his thinking by Gabriel Biel, of the Brethren of the Common Life. Biel was a disciple of Occam, and his ideas were quite fashionable in the Germany of Luther's day. Luther also diligently read Pierre d'Ailly, Gerson, Bernard of Clairvaux, Thomas Aquinas, and especially Augustine. The doctrine of predestination made him particularly restless and more distressed than ever. The thought of an arbitrary God who would predetermine a man's salvation caused him great distress. In fact, he was afraid of God, and went so far as to say that he came to "hate" God. His heavy duties gave him no release of soul. He was appointed professor of theology at Wittenberg, a university that had been founded in 1502 by Frederick the Wise of Saxony, who later became Luther's sympathetic protector.

Light finally entered Martin Luther's soul. The Reformer found God by direct contact when it dawned upon him through meditation and study that man is justified by faith alone without either the deeds of the law or the merit of good works. The road to peace and salvation was open before him. In his lectures on the Psalms (1513), Romans (1515), and Galatians (1517) he reasserted that faith is not merely an intellectual yielding to God's will but a complete surrender and a full confidence in God through Christ. His insistence on faith was so definite that when he translated the New Testament he added the word "alone" to "faith" in Rom. 3:28. This word is not in Scripture, he well knew, but argued that it had been used before by others such as Ambrose in translating this passage, and was satisfied that this concept is in harmony with the spirit of Bible teaching. Although he would not dismiss good works from a Christian life, he definitely discarded them as a means of earning God's grace.

When Luther saw the light of the gospel his course was set. He had the solution to his own problem with regard to salvation, but that did not prevent him from having spells of depression from time to time. In fact, with regard to the Christian life, he was of the opinion that a true Christian is at the same time justified and yet in another sense a sinner to the last day of his life. He felt compelled henceforth to pass on to others what he had experienced, particularly by means of his lectures, sermons, and writings. Like other priests of his time, he insistently pressed for a moral reformation of the church.

Beginning of the Reformation.—In 1517 indulgences were sold all over Germany by Tetzel, a Dominican monk. The entire proceeds were, officially, to help in the building of St. Peter's Cathedral in Rome, which seemed, to most men of that day, a worthy objective. In reality, 50 per cent of the revenue from the sale of indulgences had been allotted to the payment of a debt contracted by Albrecht of Brandenburg, who had

purchased, among others, the archbishopric of Mainz. As explained on p. 48, the issuance of indulgences was based on the belief that the pope could draw on the treasury of the merits of Christ and the saints, a storehouse of supererogatory works, to remit the temporal penalties for sin both for the living and for souls in purgatory. And Tetzel claimed for these indulgences even more than the church officially taught.

For some time Luther had openly questioned the validity of indulgences, especially since the people bought them in the erroneous belief that they were buying God's forgiveness and the right of absolution. To him this traffic was a scandal, because forgiveness is the free gift of God and cannot be sold. God forgives freely, as Luther knew from experience; no intermediary priesthood is needed, and the church has no jurisdiction over forgiveness. The true treasury of Christ, he argued, is the treasure of God's infinite grace. Luther attacked the entire system of penance and indulgences. The Ninety-five Theses, which he posted, in Latin, on the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg on October 31, 1517, are commonly regarded as beginning the Protestant Reformation.

The Ninety-five Theses proved to be an immediate and immense success. Luther himself was surprised, and questioned later whether he would have drafted them had he realized what their effect was to be on the minds of the people. He wrote apologetically to the pope six months later. But the battle had now been joined, and Luther was not a man to back down. His adversaries, such as Prierias, argued that the church is right and that the pope does not err. In the course of the struggle Luther was led step by step to assert that both pope and council could err. "The word of God alone is infallible," he declared, implying that the pope's authority is to be rejected (trans. from Choisy, *Histoire Générale du Christianisme* [4th ed.], p. 88).

At Augsburg, in 1518, the papal legate, Cardinal Cajetan, asked for Luther's submission to the pope's authority. But Luther had become a Christian in his own right, and he refused to submit to any pope. He would accept only the authority of Scripture, saying, "I would rather die, be burned or exiled, than go contrary to my conscience" (*ibid.* [1923 ed.], p. 95). Luther's attitude strongly resembled that of Hus a century earlier at the Council of Constance. This analogy was immediately and astutely seized upon at the debate at Leipzig in 1519, where Luther was cross-examined by Dr. John Eck, a humanist professor at the University of Ingolstadt. Luther's cause was now endorsed by new friends, notably Philipp Melancthon (1497–1560), who rallied to his defense. Despite a warning by his friends, Luther made certain statements that were sure to incriminate him in the eyes of the church, such as, "In condemning Hus's teachings on the church, the Council of Constance condemned truth" (*ibid.* [4th ed.], p. 89).

It is popularly believed that the theological teaching of the Catholic Church is unified. The truth is that before the Reformation it was in a state of almost infinite variation and complete confusion. Indeed, it was the Reformation that ultimately forced the Roman Catholic Church to revise and unify its theology, which it did at the Council of Trent (1545–1563). Greater diversity of thought, though without visible confusion, still exists within the Church of Rome than most Protestants or Catholics realize. Martin Luther was the first evangelical Reformer to cut a Bible-oriented path through the theological jungle. He had no apology to offer for the fact that he and his friends were "all Hussites without knowing it." The Leipzig debate clearly put Luther in the same camp as the heretic who had been burned at the stake a hundred years earlier. He had broken with the Catholic

Church of Rome and against it placed the Bible as the sole guide and interpreter for the individual Christian.

In 1520 Luther advocated his views in a number of Reformation tracts. The best known of these are: *The Address to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation*, warning the princes that times had changed and that they should cooperate in the new Reformation movement if they wanted to survive; *The Babylonian Captivity*, in which Luther developed the thought that the papacy must be challenged in its form of worship and in the sacraments; and *The Freedom of the Christian Man*, a mystical discussion of the fact that a Christian justified by faith is a freeman, yet a servant of God to his brethren.

In 1520 Luther was condemned on the basis of forty-one errors that the Vatican claimed to have found in his writings and was excommunicated from the church by the papal bull *Exsurge, Domine*. He was granted the normal sixty days' delay for submission, before the decree should become effective. Instead, on December 10, 1520, before the teachers and students of Wittenberg University, he threw into the fire the papal bull, together with some of the writings that had endorsed papal authority, such as the Isidorian Decretals.

Luther at Worms.—In 1521, a year after his condemnation by the church, Luther was summoned to appear before the Imperial Diet, which the young ruler, Charles V (1519–1556), recently crowned emperor, had called, to examine, among other items, the religious question. Lutheranism had become a major issue in Germany, and the emperor's paramount concern was the unity of the empire; heresy obviously was a major political as well as religious peril. Now that Luther had been excommunicated by the church, the state was held responsible to deal with him from a civil and political angle. By this time Lutheranism had gained immensely in favor with the people and also with the princes of the German States. When Luther heard that he had been summoned to the Imperial Diet at Worms, he wrote, "I will reply to the emperor that if I am being invited simply to recant I will not come. If to recant is all that is wanted, I can do that perfectly well right here. But if he is inviting me to my death, then I will come. I hope none but the papists will stain their hands in my blood, Antichrist reigns. The Lord's will be done" (in Roland H. Bainton, *Here I Stand*, p. 179).

When Luther appeared before the diet on April 17, 1521, he was asked two questions: (1) whether the books piled before him were his, and (2) whether he would recant all or part of his views. He answered affirmatively to the first question, and as for the second, he asked time for reflection. On the next day he gave an answer that reflected his indomitable and contagious courage as a Christian man: "Since then Your Majesty and your lordships desire a simple reply, I will answer without horns and without teeth. Unless I am convicted by Scripture and plain reason—I do not accept the authority of popes and councils, for they have contradicted each other—my conscience is captive to the Word of God. I cannot and I will not recant anything, for to go against conscience is neither right nor safe. God help me. Amen" (*ibid.*, p. 185).

This was a dramatic hour. At the risk of his life, this simple monk and university professor of peasant stock dared the state's authority after the church had pronounced him a heretic and had excommunicated him. Above all, Martin Luther was convinced that he could not do anything against his own conscience, whose "prisoner" he was. The seed of modern liberty was contained in his action of humble obedience to his inner voice, and

all Protestantism yields with him to Scripture alone and acknowledges the full surrender of the will to Christ.

The Wartburg Translation of the New Testament.—An imperial edict soon condemned Luther as “an obstinate schismatic and manifest heretic.” He was to be held in custody for the duration of his life, and he and his friends were to be deprived of the status of free citizens. They were not to be granted hospitality anywhere. The printing and the selling of his books were forbidden. Luther remained under the shadow of this edict for the rest of his life, but it was never enforced within the boundaries of the electorate of Saxony. His princely friend, Frederick the Wise of Saxony, took him into protective custody and hid him in the castle of Wartburg, in Saxony. There Luther remained under an assumed name for about nine months. During that time he wrote a number of books and sermons, but spent most of his time translating the New Testament from the Greek text. Later he translated the Old Testament also. Luther’s German Bible is one of his most significant achievements, and is to German readers what the King James Version is to English readers. His was by no means the first translation of the Bible into German, but it reveals his genius in making the Bible speak a German tongue that could be understood by the common folk and in all the sections of the country, which was linguistically divided by numerous dialects. The German Bible became a cherished possession, not only because it helped to standardize the language, but also because it brought the Word of God to bear in a living way upon everyday life.

The religious revolution could not be halted in Germany, and often it reached alarming proportions. Luther had to leave his hiding place temporarily to take over the leadership of the movement in opposition to the radicals, self-styled prophets of Zwickau, whose fanaticism was fanned by Thomas Münzer. Although a dynamic leader, Luther was not able to retain the loyalty of all who had wished for a change. Many humanists, reformers, and entire segments of the population, such as the peasants, deserted and opposed him.

The Peasants’ Revolt.—The year 1525 was most important in the life of Martin Luther. He married Katherine von Bora. Marriage is a personal matter, but his was of particular significance as evidence that he had renounced the vow of celibacy, which he had taken upon becoming a monk and later a priest. He had already expressed some of his views concerning marriage in his *Monastic Vows* (1522), a tract which he dedicated to his “dearest father.” This work, according to Justus Jonas, a co-worker of Luther, “emptied the cloisters.” Luther argued that monastic vows rest on the false assumption that the so-called holy orders confer upon a person a special and unalterable character. Luther’s marriage was significant in that the Reformer thereby broke irrevocably with the medieval monastic ideals and resolutely adopted the normal, scriptural mode of life for persons dedicated to religious activities. This revolutionary step took courage, and Luther knew that he would be criticized for it perhaps more than for any other. He insisted that marriage was not a sacrament of the church but a civil institution, and at the same time a holy and sacred estate.

The same year saw a bloody uprising of peasants in southern Germany. When Martin Luther had, a few years earlier, written to the nobility of the German nation that “in Christ there is neither slave nor free” (see p. 52), the peasants believed that he would join them in a fight for freedom. They looked upon the Reformation as the means to obtain that liberation, even by the use of force. In some sections of Germany, as for example in

Hesse, the peasants had come to terms with their prince. In Swabia their grievances were expressed in Twelve Articles, which demanded the elimination of intolerable abuses, the reduction of taxes, and the right to fish and hunt. Possibly the peasants would have come to terms in southern Germany also had it not been for the fanaticism of ill-advised leaders such as Thomas Münzer.

Luther stated that the peasants should never use force, and he bluntly warned them that if they should take up the sword, they would perish by the sword. These warnings, however, went unheeded, and the peasants began to plunder, murder, and violate the lands of their overlords. Luther felt compelled to act. In his fiery tract *Against the Murderous and Thievish Hordes of Peasants* he stated that since the peasants had disregarded his warning and had taken up the sword, he felt compelled to call upon the lords to establish order by force of arms. "Smite, slay and stab" them like mad dogs, he ordered (Bainton, *op. cit.*, p. 280). From that time on, the peasants of southern Germany considered Luther a traitor, and this attitude on his part was one reason why the southern states of Germany were lost to Protestantism. Even though Luther had little choice in the matter, it is true that thereafter he gave his support to the princes rather than to the people when their interests clashed. This attitude of Martin Luther is defended by some historians as unavoidable, and denounced by others as an irreparable error.

Luther also encountered difficulty with the increasing radicalism and fanaticism of certain religious extremists whom he referred to as *Schwärmer*. Among them was his former colleague Andreas von Carlstadt, who had divergent views on the Lord's Supper, which he considered only a memorial and not a sacrament (see Vol. VI, p. 44). Ulrich Zwingli of Zurich, was of the same opinion as Carlstadt, and since this teaching concerning the Lord's Supper was another threat to the unity of Protestants, Prince Philip of Hesse asked that the protagonists of each faction come to Marburg in 1529 to iron out their differences. The prince, to be sure, also had political unity in mind as an objective. The differences of opinion between Luther and the others were not removed, and the chasm widened between the Lutherans, on the one hand, and the Reformed, or Evangelicals, on the other.

The Diet of Augsburg and the Schmalkaldic League.—In 1530 Luther's partisans presented to the Imperial Diet of Augsburg, in Bavaria, their confession of faith, the *Confessio Augustana*, written by Melancthon. Luther was not present in person at Augsburg because he was under the imperial ban and could not leave Saxony. This confession was a remarkably mild and considered statement of Lutheran beliefs, wholly free of polemic. In fact, it seemed too mild to many, including Luther himself, who waited in the castle of Coburg in southern Saxony while his fellow Lutherans met at Augsburg.

There were still a number of leading men in Germany who thought that a reunion of Catholics and Protestants was possible. However, it became apparent that this was but a dream, and it became necessary for the Protestant German princes to form an alliance, known as the Schmalkaldic League, in 1531. War between the two factions broke out fifteen years later. The Protestant articles of Schmalkald in 1537 clearly stated the points of difference with Rome. In 1555 the peace of Augsburg granted Lutherans and Catholics equal rights in Germany, on the basis of a principle adopted at the Diet of Speier in 1526, which required a resident of any German state to accept the form of religion professed by its prince if he desired to remain there.

IV. The Reformation in Switzerland and France

Ulrich Zwingli.—Ulrich Zwingli (1484–1531) was born in the mountains of eastern Switzerland and studied in Basel, Bern, and Vienna. For ten years he functioned as priest in Glarus. First as a priest and later as a minister of the gospel, he carried a lifelong burden for the soldier. Often he accompanied soldiers onto the field of battle as a chaplain, and finally died as such in battle. Early in life Zwingli had been attracted by the teachings of the humanists. He was particularly moved by a poem in which Erasmus complained that men do not go to Jesus Christ for the solution of their religious problems, despite the fact that in Him alone can they find “happiness, forgiveness and salvation.” Zwingli was early convinced that salvation comes through faith alone, without the merit of good works.

In 1518 Zwingli came to Zurich as cathedral priest and began forthwith to preach expository sermons on the Gospel According to St. Matthew. In 1520 he surrendered the papal pension that he had received for five years, and avidly read Luther’s writings. He refused to approve fasting at the Lenten season, thus scandalizing his superior, the bishop of Constance. From then on he sought to base his teachings and his life on Scripture alone. Scripture was to him *architelēs*—the first and the last word. He soon attacked the celibacy of the priests, monastic vows, and salvation by works. With ten other priests he asked the bishop and the government of Zurich and the governments in various regions of Switzerland for permission to preach the gospel freely.

In sixty-seven theses Zwingli stressed the authority of the Bible, the mediation of Christ, and justification by faith. Inevitably he had to face the issue of whether the Christian should obey God, who speaks in the Bible, or Rome. On Easter, in the year 1525, a communion service in the German language replaced the Latin mass in the cathedral at Zurich, marking the formal commencement of the Reformation in that city. The government of Zurich took over the leadership of the church from the bishop of Constance. In 1528 Bern likewise adopted the Reformed form of worship, following a debate conducted by Zwingli, Oecolampadius of Basel, and Bucer of Strasbourg.

In comparing Zwingli with Luther, it appears that Zwingli’s religious experience was not so emotional as that of the German Reformer, but more placid and more in harmony with humanism. Whereas Luther was distressed by the question, “How can I be justified before God?” Zwingli was deeply aroused by Roman paganism and by the ignorance and superstition that prevailed throughout Christendom. His aim was to restore gospel simplicity, and he was impressed neither by mysticism nor by an elaborate form of worship. To him the Lord’s Supper was simply a memorial, and he opposed Luther’s idea of consubstantiation. The reformation of the church in Switzerland led to civil war. In 1531 Zwingli accompanied the Protestant troops on the battlefield of Kappel, where he was slain. He was an ardent patriot, a pattern for Christian statesmen. His work was continued in Zurich by Heinrich Bullinger.

John Calvin.—John Calvin (1509–1564) belongs to the second generation of Reformers. He began his work in Geneva when Luther had virtually finished his task. Born in the province of Picardy, in northeastern France, Calvin studied the humanities in Paris and law in Orléans and Bourges. He came to the conviction that the assurance of forgiveness and the certainty of salvation are to be found in the Bible. While he was at the University of Paris there was also in the student body Ignatius de Loyola, founder of the Jesuit Order. Calvin’s first love was humanism. Endowed with a keen mind

influenced by the wisdom of the past, he would have chosen the career of a humanist rather than that of a religious reformer, had he had his way. He wrote well in Latin, as his commentary on Seneca's *De Clementia* ("On Clemency") testifies. He was only twenty-three years of age when that work caught the attention of the leading humanists.

Just when and how Calvin became a Protestant cannot now be ascertained. His association with Erasmus and Lefèvre d'Étaples, his contacts in Orléans, the reading of Luther's books, and the influence of Robert Olivétan and some of his teachers helped to bring about his conversion. While he was in his teens his father had purchased a few church benefices for him, but in 1534, at the age of twenty-five, he surrendered his ecclesiastical benefices when he refused ordination to the priesthood. Calvin left France for Basel, where he published in Latin the *Institutio Religionis Christianae*, known in English as *Institutes*. This, at first, followed in six chapters the Apostles' Creed. He was only twenty-six when he produced what was to be, by far, the most influential single work on Protestant teaching. He translated this work into French and revised it in 1541. Calvin further revised and enlarged the *Institutes* until it reached its final form in 1559, a book of eighty-three chapters.

The *Institutes*, in final form, is a comprehensive treatise dealing with (1) the knowledge of God as Creator and Sovereign, (2) the knowledge of God as Redeemer in Christ, (3) the means by which the grace of Christ can be obtained, and (4) the means used by God to lead us to Christ. Though Calvin's ideas were not altogether new, he set forth in a novel way what he thought had been taught in the Christian church before the Roman Catholic Church altered the basic teachings of the apostles. The *Institutes* is the most inclusive systematic presentation of the Protestant faith ever written. Calvin, of course, considered the Scriptures to be the authoritative record of God's works; his entire system is based on God's sovereign will, which transcends everything. He dedicated this monumental work to the king of France, before whom he sought to present evangelical Christians as loyal citizens instead of as subversives, as their foes charged.

Passing through Geneva in 1536, the same year in which Reformed worship was introduced in that city, Calvin was urged by Farel to remain and assist him in his labors. Together with Farel he endeavored to create a model church, a spiritual government based on a harmonious collaboration between church and civil government. Finding it impossible to carry out the plan for Geneva at that time, Calvin remained there little more than a year upon this occasion.

In April, 1538, the two Reformers were ousted from Geneva for refusing to comply with measures they regarded as civil interferences in church affairs. Calvin found refuge in Strasbourg and served the French community there as pastor and teacher, besides revising the *Institutes*. He married Idelette de Bure, the widow of an Anabaptist. In Strasbourg, Calvin also worked out the church liturgy that became the basis of church organization in his later work. In attending some of the German diets he met and formed a friendship with Melancthon. Meanwhile, a government more friendly to Calvin was formed in Geneva, and he was urged to return, but the thought of returning to a city from which he had been ousted was most repugnant to him. Calvin wrote to Farel that he would prefer to endure a thousand deaths rather than this cross (of returning to Geneva). But Farel insisted, and finally Calvin gave in. "If I were given the choice, I would do anything rather than yield to you in this matter," he wrote to Farel; "but since I remember

that I am not my own, I offer my heart as if slain in sacrifice to the Lord” (in Williston Walker, *John Calvin*, pp. 259, 260).

For the next fourteen years Calvin fought incessantly with his adversaries in Geneva. More than fifty persons were exiled, imprisoned, or executed. The most sensational of these cases was that of Servetus, who was executed in 1553. Servetus was rated a heretic by both Catholics and Protestants because he was in disagreement with basic Christian teachings, particularly the doctrine of the Trinity. Calvin, who in his early experience had himself been in difficulty over this doctrine in his controversy with Bolsec, considered it his duty to rid the Christian church of Servetus, who was obnoxious not only to him in Geneva but also to leaders elsewhere in Switzerland whose opinion Calvin had solicited and obtained in this particular case.

The condemnation of Servetus gave Calvin a decisive advantage in Geneva, for henceforth his position was unchallenged, and he carried forward his plan to reform the morals of the church. He published the final edition of the *Institutes* and was instrumental in having Theodore Beza called to the leadership of the newly founded academy at Geneva. Of a frail physical constitution and constantly besieged by ailments of various kinds, Calvin died in 1564. But he had solidly established his church government in Geneva and had set a pattern for evangelism that brought the Protestant faith not only to his native France but also to Holland, England, and America. Geneva had become a center of attraction for leading men of many countries. One of them was John Knox of Scotland, who spent some time in Geneva.

The characteristic traits of Calvinist Reformation are: (1) The central place given to the doctrine of the sovereignty of God in creation, in government, and in the redemption of the world (predestination). For more than a hundred years historians have affirmed that predestination is the central theme of Calvin’s theology. But it is more acceptable to state that, in Calvin’s view, belief in predestination is rather the ultimate result of our faith in God’s grace. In the first Latin edition of his *Institutes* (1536) predestination is not discussed as a separate doctrine. (2) The institution of church discipline through the Consistory, the body of pastors and ministers of Geneva, who governed moral disorders and repressed false teachings. (3) The government of the church by leaders elected by church members. This presbyterian synodical system gave great importance to the cooperation of lay members in the affairs of the church and directly influenced the representative political form of government in democratic countries. (4) The teaching that in the Lord’s Supper the sincere participant receives with the bread and the wine the virtue of the body and the blood of Jesus Christ, namely, the graces that are represented by the elements. (5) Calvin’s genius as organizer and as propagator of the faith, which led him to create a system that enabled Protestantism to spread rapidly. One of the main methods consisted in the training of ministers, evangelists, and teachers in the newly founded academy of Geneva. This academy later became the University of Geneva, which Thomas Jefferson referred to as one of the two “intellectual eyes” of Europe; in his opinion the other “eye” was Edinburgh.

Luther was able to free the Christian conscience from Roman legalism; Zwingli liberated Christian thinking from the errors and abuses of Roman paganism; but Calvin was the educator of the Christian conscience, which he submitted to the authority of God. By educating the Christian conscience and organizing masterfully the Christian church, he helped to prepare men for the advent of political and religious freedom.

The Huguenots of France.—In the reign of Francis I (1515–1547) attempts were made by humanists and evangelicals to reform the church. Foremost among these were the Fabrisians, or the followers of Lefèvre d'Étaples (Faber Stapulensis). In 1521 they gathered around Guillaume Bricconnet, the bishop of Meaux. Theirs was an attempt to eliminate the abuses of the church and to stress a more evangelical preaching. Most influential in sponsoring this humanistic pre-Calvinist movement was Margaret of Navarre, the sister of King Francis. Learned and interested in the ideas of the “biblicists,” she invited some of them to preach in the Louvre, the king’s palace in Paris. She wrote a number of works that have a Lutheran flavor, especially *The Mirror of the Sinful Soul*, in 1531. With changing political conditions the king of France was intermittently interested in new ideas, and favored the “Lutherans” of France. When he needed the help of the German Lutheran princes, the Lutherans in France had a moment of respite. The king’s cousin, Louis de Berquin, was a conspicuous but ill-advised French “Lutheran” executed for his faith in 1529. “If Francis had upheld him to the last, he [Berquin] would have been the Luther of France” (Theodore Beza, quoted in *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, vol. 2, p. 69, art. “Louis de Berquin”).

After the death of Francis I and his gifted sister, the kings of France tried to restore Roman Catholicism. Meanwhile, the minority Protestant group—the Huguenots—had become a political faction. The Huguenots soon counted leading noblemen in their midst—Henry of Navarre, Anthony de Bourbon, Admiral de Coligny, and Louis of Condé, France’s best general of the time. In 1562 an intermittent religious civil war broke out in France. This had political and religious causes, and lasted till 1594. The outstanding event was the bloody St. Bartholomew’s Massacre in August, 1572. When the leading Huguenots came to Paris to attend the marriage of their king, Henry of Navarre, many of them were slaughtered, together with countless thousands of the rank and file of the Huguenots.

A Huguenot, Henry, king of Navarre, a grandson of Margaret, was offered the crown of France on condition that he would abjure Protestantism. This he did for political expediency, but during his reign as the first of the Bourbon dynasty (1589–1610), he favored the Huguenots as ministers and advisors. He promulgated the Edict of Nantes (1598), which was easily the most liberal freedom charter granted thus far in Western Europe. It declared the Roman Catholic religion to be the national religion but granted the Huguenots a remarkable degree of freedom. They were no longer to be persecuted for the sake of religion, but no Reformed service was allowed to be held in Paris or within 20 mi. of it. He assigned cities of refuge to the Huguenots, who were also given the right to hold public office. Henry IV had just devised, with his minister Sully, a plan of universal understanding and peace, referred to as the “great design,” when he was assassinated by Ravallac, a fanatical monk, in 1610. The Edict of Nantes was partially abrogated in 1628 by Cardinal Richelieu and was completely revoked by Louis XIV in 1685.

Freedom of Conscience.—The Church of Rome is, historically, intolerant in principle, holding that since it is the only true church, no other church has any right to exist. How can error and heresy have rights? it asks. Baptism unites the soul bodily to the church, which demands unconditional submission to the priest as a requisite for salvation. Thus it is the church’s right and also its duty to bring the heretic back to the fold, to save his soul. If he refuses, it is better that he be put to death, for he is a constant danger to

pious souls. This principle stands unrepudiated, but the church, in its 1917 canon law, has rendered inoperative all penalties beyond excommunication.

Protestantism clearly enunciated the principle of freedom of conscience, but it remained only a principle for a long time. In practice Protestantism also demanded full submission to what it considered the *Unam Sanctam*, the “One Holy Church.” Those who opposed these teachings were disciplined, if not put to death as was Servetus in Geneva. Prior to the French Revolution people were expected to accept the religion of their prince (see p. 55). In one German region, the Palatinate for instance, the inhabitants had to change their religion six times in less than a century because of the fact that the successive rulers represented different religious faiths.

In France, when the Edict of Nantes was revoked, persecution of the Huguenots raged again. The atrocities perpetrated in the name of religious unity in the kingdom finally aroused the public conscience. Louis XVI granted civil status to Protestants in 1787, by the Edict of Toleration. Emperor Napoleon in 1804 proclaimed it to be his intention and firm determination that freedom of worship be maintained. He affirmed his conviction that the rule of the law ends where the rule of conscience begins and that neither the law nor the ruler can do anything against that freedom. But that liberty was officially condemned by Pope Pius IX in the *Syllabus of Errors* in 1864. A formal and complete separation of church and state became effective in France only in 1905.

V. The Reformation in England

Establishment of the Anglican Church.—With the way prepared by Wyclif’s Lollards, the English Reformation took great strides forward in the 16th century. However, the English Reformation differs from those on the Continent in three noteworthy respects: (1) Two antipapal movements progressed simultaneously in England in the 16th century—the religious movements embodying humanistic, Lutheran, and Wyclifite influences; and a political movement that aimed at placing all religious authority with the king instead of with the pope. (2) There were constant conflicts, especially at the end of the century, between Romanizing and Protestant parties within the Anglican Church. (3) There was a marked tendency in England toward a compromise in matters of doctrine and liturgy. A man of great conviction could not assert his views, partly because of the strong-willed sovereigns of the Tudor dynasty, especially Henry VIII. Thus the Anglican theology does not show the same vigor and independence as the religious systems of Calvin and Luther.

Henry VIII (1509–1547) took several decisive steps: he proclaimed himself sole head of the Anglican Church, and later dissolved the monasteries. The king remained Roman Catholic in doctrine and liturgy, and crushed all opposition: Catholics were hanged for treason and Protestants for heresy. More favorable to Protestantism was his son Edward VI (1547–1553). Protestant leaders were invited from the Continent to England, and under the direction of Thomas Cranmer the Book of Common Prayer, in two successive editions (1549, 1552), showed a marked trend toward compromise with Protestant teaching. Next, Mary Tudor (1553–1558) was a fervent Catholic, like her mother, Catherine of Aragon. She was encouraged in her pursuits by her husband, Philip II of Spain, the son of Emperor Charles V. Several hundred leading Protestants were executed on the fields of Smithfield near London, among them Cranmer, Ridley, Hooker, Rogers, et cetera. During her reign many Protestants escaped and found refuge on the Continent in Frankfurt, Strasbourg, Geneva, and various German towns.

With the advent of Elizabeth I (1558–1603), Protestantism regained strength in England. Many of the exiles of the Marian period returned, and brought back the conviction that even though the Anglican Church was the recognized state church of England, its doctrinal reforms did not go far enough. Queen Elizabeth loved pageantry and pomp in the church. She was Protestant in doctrine, but introduced into Anglican liturgy and rites many practices that displeased English Reformers. But increasingly the Puritan element gained in importance, demanding change to a more simple and less sacerdotal form of worship.

In order to define church doctrine, the Thirty-nine Articles of faith were promulgated in 1571, a modification of the Forty-two Articles of the reign of Edward VI. All priests and ministers were required to subscribe to them. The Church of England was defended by eminent scholars such as John Jewel, bishop of Salisbury, who wrote the *Apologia pro Ecclesia Anglicana* (1562), the first methodical statement of the position of the Church of England against the Church of Rome. Even more remarkable was Richard Hooker's *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1594, 1597). Hooker took a position against Catholicism as well as against the Puritan Presbyterians. It was his opinion that the episcopal form of government was best for the Church of England. He saw church and state as two aspects of the same commonwealth, both of which were to be under the direct leadership of the sovereign.

During the reign of Elizabeth I there was a Roman Catholic revival led by Cardinal William Allen (1532–1594). A graduate of Oxford, he refused to take the oath of allegiance to Elizabeth, and later went to Rome. In 1568 he founded a seminary in Douai in Spanish Flanders, across the Channel and easily accessible to English Catholics. Many English missionaries were trained there to return to their mother country. A Catholic translation of the Bible into English was produced, the Douai-Rheims Version. The New Testament was published at Rheims in 1582, the Old Testament in two volumes at Douai, in 1609. English Catholics had great hope, and used all kinds of schemes and intrigues, some of which centered on Mary Stuart (1542–1587), Queen of Scots, who by blood relationship had a claim to the throne of England.

Puritans and Separatists.—Much more influential in Elizabeth's reign than the Catholics, were the Puritans. Their aim was to "purify" the Church of England from all vestiges of Romanism. Among them were many who had been trained on the Continent, particularly at Geneva. Puritans differed among themselves as to the measure in which they should manifest their loyalty to the sovereign. Some advocated a presbyterian form of church government. Prominent among the leading Presbyterian Puritans under Elizabeth was Thomas Cartwright. John Whitgift, the Archbishop of Canterbury, arranged for Cartwright to be deprived of his professorship at Cambridge. Whitgift, as nominal head of the Anglican Church, stood for absolute loyalty to Elizabeth's policy of uniformity.

Even more radical than the Puritans were the Separatists, or Independents. The Puritans asked to remain within the Church of England, which they longed to see cleansed from all traces of Catholicism. On the other hand, the Separatists, or Independents, like the Anabaptists on the Continent, believed the formation of churches separate from the state church to be a necessity. They were separatists in that they withdrew from the Church of England, and were independents in that they believed in the full autonomy of a local church. They envisioned each congregation, with Christ as its

head, as a self-governing church, electing its own pastor and other officers after what they supposed to be the pattern of the New Testament. Their outstanding pioneer leader was Robert Browne (c. 1550–c. 1633), a graduate of Cambridge, who began as a Puritan.

Among those who had returned from the Continent during the 16th century was John Knox (c. 1505–1572). Ordained a priest in Scotland, he and some of his young followers joined a group in St. Andrew's Castle and soon preached Protestant views. After being captured and taken to France for nineteen months as a galley prisoner, he went to England, where the Reformation was favorably viewed by Edward VI. Under Mary Tudor's reign he fled to the Continent and went to Geneva. There he became an ardent disciple of John Calvin.

The visit of John Knox to Scotland in 1555 gave a great impetus to the Reformation in that land. In 1557 the Scotch nobility, for political and religious reasons, entered into a covenant to establish "the more blessed word of God and his congregation." They were accordingly called the Lords of the Congregation. In 1561 Scotland officially went over to the Reformation, but the regent's prohibition of Reformed preaching resulted in a civil war. The Scottish Parliament adopted a confession that had been drafted by Knox and was definitely Calvinistic in spirit. Knox demanded and obtained the protection of the civil authorities to bring about the changes he deemed necessary. In order to reorganize the church according to his principles and on the pattern of Calvin's church in Geneva, Knox wrote *The First Book of Discipline*. A system of schools was planned, with advanced education in universities. This insistence on the importance of education was greatly emphasized by the Reformers generally. *The First Book of Discipline* also encouraged a wholesome spirit of independence. Public worship was reorganized according to Knox's *Book of Common Order* adopted in 1564, which showed the marked influence of Calvin and which remained a standard work in the Presbyterian Church until 1645.

Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, married to Francis II of France, returned to Scotland upon the death of her husband. A loyal Catholic, she attended mass in her chapel in Scotland. From his pulpit of St. Giles in the Cathedral of Edinburgh, Knox thundered against this revival of the mass and pointed to the frivolities of Mary's court. For a while it seemed that Catholicism stood a fair opportunity of succeeding again in Scotland. Mary's unfortunate matrimonial ventures with Lord Darnley, a Roman Catholic, and her scheming to succeed to the English throne after the reign of childless Queen Elizabeth, did not improve her standing with the Protestant nobles of Scotland. Civil strife in Scotland drove Mary out of her homeland to seek refuge in England, where she was executed in 1587 on the charge of complicity in a plot to assassinate Elizabeth. Knox, eloquent, fiery fighter for the Lord, lived to see his cause triumph in Scotland.

The Puritans Fight Royal Absolutism.—With the passing of Elizabeth Tudor, a new dynasty came to the English throne, the Stuarts of Scotland. James VI of Scotland, son of Mary Stuart, became king of England as James I (1603–1625). From the outset he turned against the Catholics and extreme wings of Protestantism alike. In 1604 he ordered the priests banished, and Parliament confirmed the Elizabethan laws against Catholics. This eventually led to the famous Gunpowder Plot, which was an attempt to eliminate the king and the House of Lords. The discovery of the plot aroused a great anti-Roman Catholic feeling, leading to even more stringent acts against Catholics.

The Presbyterians were opposed to the episcopal form of church government and to the notion of the divine right of kings. The king was determined to make the English people conform to the established Anglican Church. The rigor and dogmatism of the Puritans were only enhanced by the sovereign's attitude; they stressed strict observance of Sunday, Bible reading, and services in the homes, and insisted on purity of morals. Among the Puritans under James I there were various factions: (1) the Presbyterians, who preferred a church government by a regularly elected board of presbyters, or elders; (2) the Independents, who insisted on the voluntary and free aspect of a church as a community of believers and who considered the government of the church to reside in the parish, or congregation; (3) the Baptists, who came mostly from the Independents. They advocated adult baptism, mostly by immersion, considering infant baptism incompatible with true Christian belief and practice.

The King James Bible.—James I was also opposed to a demand for a mild Protestant reform that was submitted to him by the Puritans in 1603 in the Millenary Petition (so called because it was supposed to have a thousand signatures). In 1604 a conference of bishops and Puritans was held at Hampton Court; the one tangible result was the initiation of a new Bible translation. During the preceding dynasty two new versions of the Bible had been issued, the Bishops' Bible, used chiefly in the churches, and the Geneva Bible, based on Tyndale's New Testament, with another translation for the Old Testament, basically that of the Bishops' Bible. To produce this new translation James appointed fifty-four scholars, divided into various companies of nine men each, working individually. A committee of twelve went over the entire text. They used the original languages in the best available texts. The work began in 1604 and ended with the publication of the translation in 1611. Although it is referred to as the Authorized Version, there is no proof that it ever enjoyed the formal approval of the king. This version does not bear the stamp of the genius of one particular man, as is the case with Luther's German translation. It was the product of many minds; and in spite of many other translations that have been published, it has remained the standard and beloved text of the English-speaking world for three and a half centuries.

Emigration of the Separatists to America.—As the Separatists, or Independents, were persecuted in England, some of them at first sought refuge on the Continent, particularly in Holland, a Calvinist stronghold. It was in Amsterdam that the first English Baptist church arose among the Separatists, under the leadership of John Smyth, who died in 1612. The Separatists, who were despised by the conservative Anglicans and even by a large body of English Puritans, did not find the solution to their problems in Holland, and entered into negotiations with the Virginia Company. They were invited to the Virginia Colony by Sir Edwin Sandys, who granted the Leyden congregation land in what was called the "northern parts of Virginia." Instead of bringing them to the territory for which they had negotiated, however, the *Mayflower*, upon which the 102 Pilgrims had embarked for their new home, took them in November, 1620, to the barren shores of Cape Cod, which belonged to the Plymouth Company. The Pilgrims were not legally entitled to settle there; besides, no government had been provided for this region. Consequently, before landing, the settlers drew up a charter of their own, a document called the Mayflower Compact. Each member agreed to support the majority; all men made up the assembly, which became both a legislative and a judicial body, and which chose a governor and his assistants. Out of these beginnings, as the number of inhabitants

and communities increased, they developed a system of sound government for the local units, and each of these sent representatives to the general court, or assembly, of the whole colony. Incidentally, of the approximately one hundred Pilgrims who came over on the *Mayflower*, a mere dozen or so constituted the membership of the first church.

A second exodus of English nonconformists to the New World took place in the reign of Charles I, among them being a number of Puritans. A group of these nonconformists met at Cambridge, England, under the leadership of John Winthrop and organized a company, the control of which rested with those who went to America. They secured land rights on Massachusetts Bay, up the coast from Plymouth, and during 1630 about one thousand of the Puritans came. This was referred to as the Great Migration. By 1642 the colony contained sixteen thousand persons.

Massachusetts Bay Colony was based on theocratic principles, Old Testament legislation being made a pattern for the punishment of sorcery, blasphemy, idolatry, gambling, and the breaking of the "Lord's Day." The acts of these settlers were at least as intolerant as those of the men from whom they had fled. Disagreements in Massachusetts led to the beginning of another colony, Rhode Island. Its founder, the young pastor Roger Williams, and later Mrs. Anne Hutchinson and her followers, were driven out of Massachusetts because of their religious views. In 1636 Williams and others founded Providence on Narragansett Bay; it was to be a "shelter for persons distressed in conscience." In 1638 Mrs. Hutchinson's followers settled at Portsmouth, on a nearby island, and a little later the settlement at Newport was begun. All these towns were granted complete freedom of religion and speech, and in 1663 they formed a union and received a charter from Charles II.

Charles I and the Puritans (1625–1649).—The doctrine of the divine right of kings, which was brilliantly advocated in France by the Jesuit Cardinal Richelieu, made of the king of France (Louis XIII in this instance) a monarch reigning by God's favor, and it was to God that the king was presumably accountable. This idea became fashionable in England under the Stuarts, who were attracted by the Roman Catholic concept of government. Charles I, whose wife was the sister of Louis XIII, was convinced that as king he should rule by divine right and by seeking the welfare of the people; he must not in any way submit to control either by his subjects or by Parliament. Charles attempted to let Parliament interfere as little as possible with his policies, and the relationship between king and Parliament became strained from that time onward. Ill advised by Strafford and Laud, the king purposed to rule eventually without Parliament. His attempt to force episcopacy and the English Book of Common Prayer on Scotland was one of the reasons for the conflict between Parliament and king. The Puritans, favoring the parliamentary rights and being in the majority in Commons, were greatly opposed to the Book of Common Prayer and to episcopacy. The civil war that ensued in 1642 was fought on one side by the king's men, the Cavaliers, and on the other by the Puritans and the Parliament, the Roundheads. The war turned out favorably for the Puritans, and the king fled to Scotland. Upon his return to England, he was tried and condemned for state treason, and beheaded in January, 1649.

The Westminster Assembly.—Parliament abolished the use of the Book of Common Prayer and substituted for it a form of worship framed by the Westminster Assembly. This assembly, called to advise Parliament on religious questions, was composed of clergy and laity, mostly Puritans, and convened in 1643. In addition to the "Directory for

the Public Worship of God” it drew up what is usually called the Westminster Confession of Faith. This was completed in 1647 and was debated in Parliament, but was never formally authorized by that body. The Confession of Faith endorsed the Puritan form of worship and was expressed in two catechisms. These became the symbol of the Scottish Presbyterian churches, and set forth the Reformed system of theology and church government. They were shaped much less by Calvin than by either the Augustinian or the Covenanter theology. The assembly was influenced also by the Irish articles of 1615, which were attributed to Archbishop James Ussher (1581–1656), of the Church of Ireland. He is best remembered for drawing up a Biblical chronology that was long accepted (see Vol. I, p. 179). The archbishop, however, refused to come to the Westminster Assembly.

The Church Under Oliver Cromwell.—After the victory of Parliament over the king’s men, the execution of Charles I created a political vacuum. A republic was proclaimed while the Long Parliament was still in session, but after 1653 Oliver Cromwell became Lord Protector of the British Commonwealth. He strengthened the navy, fought the Catholics in Ireland, opposed Spanish expansion, and resisted the rising menace of Dutch sea power. Most of all, Cromwell changed England into a Puritan theocracy in which the army was supposed to fight the battles of the Lord. Chiliastic movements continued to grow or to spring up, such as the Ranters, Diggers, Seekers, and Levellers. There were also the Fifth Monarchy Men, who were convinced that the four monarchies of Daniel 2 had now passed and that Christ’s kingdom, the fifth monarchy, was about to begin. They proposed to hasten its advent, even at the price of armed violence.

Cromwell’s era was an age of remarkable men such as Milton, Bunyan, and George Fox. The Society of Friends, or Quakers, founded by George Fox, soon took root on a much firmer basis than the other religious movements. When Fox, who was of very humble birth, came to the realization, in 1647, that he was to be converted by following the “inner light,” the entire world appeared new to him, and even the earth had a “new smell.” He renounced oaths and insisted on honesty and the speaking of truth, practiced simplicity in dress, food, and action, refused to participate in war, and denounced formalism in religion. Fox’s message found a great response in England and Wales, on the Continent, and in America. Many became his followers.

Cromwell endeavored to prevent religious chaos. He achieved a degree of religious toleration, but also endorsed a national church supported by the state. The Book of Common Prayer was not to be used in its services, and there were to be no bishops. But the Bible was to be preached, and ministers were therefore to be carefully chosen. They were to be supported by the tithes, from a central fund. All Protestants except Quakers were tolerated. The clergy might be Presbyterian, Independent, or Baptist; Episcopalians might meet for worship if they did so quietly, and even Roman Catholics were left alone if they did not disturb the public peace.

Restoration of the Stuarts.—After Cromwell’s death in 1658 the country fell into anarchy, and the restoration of the Stuart dynasty was inevitable. Charles II (1660–1685), the “merry king,” son of the beheaded Charles I, was greatly influenced by Catholic diplomacy. He admired and emulated Louis XIV of France. He took action against the Puritans by the Act of Uniformity (1662), which resulted in the exile and imprisonment

of thousands of Puritans. By the Test Act (1673) only the Anglican profession of faith was approved.

Charles II was succeeded by his brother, James II (1685–1688). Though the latter was an avowed Roman Catholic, Parliament, with a Tory majority at that time, took no action. This was doubtless largely because of the fact that the king's two daughters, Mary and Anne, were Protestants. But in 1688 a son, James, was born and baptized a Catholic. It thus became evident that Roman Catholicism was to be perpetuated. The realization of this produced a bloodless change of government commonly referred to as the Glorious Revolution, and brought to the throne William of Orange and Mary Stuart. The main consequence of the Glorious Revolution was the enactment of the Bill of Rights by Parliament in 1689. James II had fled to France; Mary and her consort, William of Orange, the stadholder of Holland, ruled as constitutional Protestant sovereigns. The Bill of Rights declared illegal many of the measures of James II and stipulated that no Roman Catholic should ever wear the crown of England. The bill granted partial religious freedom to various Protestant confessions. Catholics and Socinians were not granted freedom of worship, nor was anyone admitted to public office or matriculated in a university if not a member of the Anglican communion. Marriage and baptism were to be valid only when performed by an Anglican priest.

VI. The Catholic Counter Reformation

The Jesuits.—Protestant forced the Catholic Church to redefine its theology, to reorganize its church, and to reappraise its method. The most active agency in the Counter Reformation was the Jesuits, a product of Spanish Catholicism. In fighting the Moors the Catholics had developed a fierce religious and patriotic fanaticism. In the 16th century Spain had become the leading nation of the world, and Spanish royalty sought to establish its absolutism in politics and religion.

In pursuing this latter aim Ignatius de Loyola (1491–1556) was particularly and efficiently active. The founder of the Jesuit Order started as a soldier. Wounded in 1521 in the battle of Pampeluna, he abandoned his military career and decided he would become a devoted soldier of the pope and specialize in the suppression of the church's enemies. After anguishing inner struggles he offered his services to the pope in order to propagate the Catholic faith and repress heresy. He founded (1534) the Society of Jesus at Montmartre in Paris. This was approved by Pope Paul III in 1540, through the bull *Regimini militantis Ecclesioe*. The Jesuits make the usual monastic vows; in addition they make a particular vow of obedience to the pope. The order was founded on the principle of complete surrender of individual judgment and on military discipline. Loyola wrote a tract, *Spiritual Exercises*, indicating how the will of the individual could and must be subjected, and how each person might submit completely to the will of his superior, who personifies Christ. This principle is opposed to the Protestant idea that the individual must obey his conscience enlightened by the Scriptures, which are the supreme authority in matters of faith.

The Jesuits were able to restore confidence to German Catholics. They took over the schools and took the initiative in all important endeavors. They also gave direction to statesmen through a Machiavellian opportunism, and encouraged the idea of mental reservation. They are to be regarded as having instigated many of the actions taken against the Protestants, such as the St. Bartholomew's Massacre, and also the great crises in Germany that culminated in the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648). The Jesuits proved to

be a militia that enabled the church to apply its methods of absolute authority and to centralize all its power in the papacy.

The Council of Trent.—The pope dreaded the meeting of a church council, but he was urged to call a council by Emperor Charles V, whose ambition still was to achieve political and religious unity. The council, which was organized in 1542 at Trent, an Italian and imperial city, met intermittently from 1545 to 1563. The meeting of a council was overdue; from many sides such a meeting had been requested, and Luther himself at the outset of his reformatory work had asked for such a gathering. When Pope Paul III called this council he feared political pressure, the precedent of the reforming councils of the 15th century not having been reassuring. But he was offered effective help by the Jesuits. The emperor, hoping that the problem of German unity would be solved, requested a representation of Protestant princes as well as of Catholics. From the beginning the pope was interested merely in doctrines he wanted defined, as opposed to the Protestant views voiced in the Augsburg Confession of 1530.

In the first period (1545–1547) Catholic doctrine was defined in an answer to Protestant views. At the beginning the Spanish Dominicans, the disciples of Thomas Aquinas, were leading out, but they were soon supplanted by the Jesuits. The source of truth, it was decreed, is found in the Bible *and* tradition; this gave the church power to interpret the Bible in its own way. In the definition of justification, divine grace was confirmed as a basic teaching, but the doctrine of the merit of good works was also retained. Thus, man cooperates with divine grace by means of free will, but good works increase the chance of justification. Justification depends on the sacraments, which are a means of salvation, and begins with baptism, the first of the sacraments. It is increased by confirmation and the eucharist and, if lost, can be regained by penance.

In the second period of the council (1551–1552) the emperor demanded that the Protestants participate in the debates but in the first phase of the council Protestant influence was so weak that it was disregarded. Yet when Pope Julius III opened this council it seemed that there might be a basis of agreement between the two confessions. However, the emperor's wish for a union was suddenly annulled by the defection of Maurice of Saxony, who left the emperor to serve the Protestant cause. This forced the emperor to leave the Council of Trent abruptly, and it also ended all Protestant participation in the council.

After ten years of interruption the Council of Trent resumed its sessions, entering upon its third period (1562–1563). Meanwhile, Protestantism had taken firm root in Germany and was officially recognized by the Peace of Augsburg in 1555. On the Catholic side, the Jesuits had reverted to methods of the Inquisition, and the delicate question of episcopal power was debated at great length. Henceforth, the main dogma is that of the church, a divinely instituted and guarded hierarchy. The ordinary Catholic is best advised to let the priest be his guide, his “director of conscience.” One influential leader, Cardinal Borromeo of Milan, a specialist in religious education, urged the founding of theological seminaries.

The council particularly affirmed the following basic religious institutions: (1) the pope, in whose hands is vested the power of the church, as vicar of Jesus Christ; (2) the Latin text of the Bible (the Vulgate) as alone accepted, but not available to the layman; (3) the seven sacraments. In addition, theological seminaries were to be built, and the

Congregation of the Index was created to examine all printed matter, in order to shield the orthodox Catholic from harmful publications.

VII. Religious Revivals From About 1650–1750

Pietism in Germany.—After the Peace of Augsburg in 1555 it was hoped that the problem of German Catholics and Protestants living together in peace had been solved. However, in spite of the principle (adopted fifteen years earlier) that each region should have its own religion, the situation worsened, and the two confessions eventually crystallized into two political factions. Tension came to a tragic climax in the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648), which started with the Bohemian revolt against the Holy Roman Empire. The conflict was precipitated by attempts to install Catholic governors over recognized Protestant districts, in contravention of the Peace of Augsburg. In addition to the religious reasons for this war, there were also political motives. After some years Denmark was drawn into the conflict, then Sweden, and finally France. The dramatic moment came when the king of Sweden, Gustavus Adolphus, being induced to help the hard-pressed Protestants on the Continent, and doubtless also to make political gains for Sweden, entered the conflict. In one of the fiercest battles of the war, at Lützen (1632), the Swedes won a brilliant victory, but Gustavus Adolphus was killed.

The French minister, Cardinal Richelieu, who partially abrogated the Edict of Nantes, intervened on the Protestant side in the Thirty Years' War because his ambition on the political scene was to crush the Catholic House of Austria, France's traditional enemy on the Continent. The war ended with the important Treaty of Westphalia (1648), which, generally speaking, brought religious peace to Western Europe. It also constituted an elaborate political charter for Western European countries and recognized a number of new sovereign states. Hardly was the devastating Thirty Years' War over, however, when Louis XIV invaded the Palatinate—on three different occasions—to plunder and burn. This caused mass emigrations of Germans, many of whom William Penn welcomed in his newly acquired Pennsylvania.

In less than a hundred years, Lutheranism, with which the Reformation had started, crystallized into a formalistic and dogmatic movement. What might be called a new scholasticism came into being in Lutheran Germany, based on an elaborate and subtle theological system. Many God-fearing Lutherans among the clergy, and also in the rank and file of the church, were alarmed at the religious formalism. In 1621 Johann Arndt reminded his contemporaries that in order to be a good Lutheran it was necessary first to begin being a good Christian. In an important work entitled *Vom Wahren Christentum* ("True Christianity") he insisted on a deep Christian experience, and stressed the importance of personal piety.

In revolt against the trend toward dogmatic theology and a formalistic ritualism there arose a movement—unorganized but effective—known as Pietism, whose chief purpose was to revive personal, experimental religion. Its chief leader in Germany was Philipp Spener. In 1660 Spener came in contact with Jean de Labadie, a former Jesuit priest who later became a pastor of the Reformed church. Labadie urged the organizing, wherever possible, of conventicles, or small study groups.

Philip Spener (1635–1705) was born at Ribeauville in Alsace. He studied theology in Geneva and was appointed minister in Frankfurt in 1666. He learned from Sebastian Schmidt in Strasbourg that a detailed study of the Confession of Faith should give way to an exegetical study of the Bible. Spener's preface to Arndt's book, *Wahres Christentum*,

became the important part of the book, and was published separately in 1675 under the title *Pia Desideria* ("Pious Wishes"). It had a much wider circulation than the book of which it originally constituted only the preface. *Pia Desideria* contains the basic principles of Pietism. Spener recommended an assiduous study of the Bible in cottage meetings (conventicles) and small gatherings for edification and mutual encouragement called *collegia pietatis*. He urged closer participation of lay members in the affairs of the church. He called for simpler methods in teaching the Bible and urged pastors to be less ritualistic and dogmatic and to keep very close to the Scriptures in their sermons. He laid great stress on the study of the prophecies, and awakened a new interest in eschatology, particularly in the second advent of Christ. Spener was called to pastor various large churches, particularly those of Dresden and Berlin. But the real center of Pietism in Germany was Halle, where he became administrator of the university. Spener called a disciple, August Hermann Francke, to be a professor, and insisted that the Bible should be taught and studied on exegetical principles. From that university came the first Lutheran missionaries in 1695.

One of the most important results of Pietism was the new formation of church known as *Unitas Fratrum*, or Unity of the Brethren, which was founded by Spener's godson Count Zinzendorf (1700–1760). When quite young, Zinzendorf gave his heart to the Lord, as he wrote in his diary, after having been impressed by a painting by Domenico Fetti representing the thorn-crowned Saviour. The painting bore this legend: "This is what I have done for you—what have *you* done for me?" Into his domain at Herrnhut in Moravia he welcomed Protestant refugees from persecution. Zinzendorf had the gift of getting men of various backgrounds and temperaments to live together harmoniously in a church which he called the "Unity." From the Hussites he borrowed the episcopate, from the Pietists a conservatist confession, from the Calvinists a strict moral discipline, from the Presbyterians church organization, and from the Lutherans the central teaching of justification by faith. He melded all these elements into a Moravian form of Christianity that has found expression in the beautiful Moravian hymns that have comforted Christians all over the world. Zinzendorf was notably evangelistic—and missionary-minded. Lay members should work diligently in various phases of home missions, evangelism, and even foreign missions.

Pietism had an unfortunate clannish tendency, and a form of religious pride arose among some of the members of the "college of piety." At times artificial means were recommended to lead men to repentance. But in spite of these shortcomings Pietism was a worthy reform movement within the Lutheran Church, and exercised a decided influence on the early Methodists.

Religious Revival in England; The Methodists.—Following the Glorious Revolution of 1688–1689 the moral and religious conditions in England were deplorable. Like the Lutheran Church, the Church of England had become altogether formal in its worship and dogmatic in its teaching. It was incapable of lifting the vision of the people or of ministering to their spiritual needs. An awakening was urgently needed. That awakening began in 1729, when a few students at Oxford University formed a religious circle. They were nicknamed "methodists," and sometimes "the holy club," because they followed a methodical pattern of life, including regular periods of fasting, weekly communion, and prayer at appointed times.

John Wesley (1703–1791), the leader of Methodism, was in contact with the Moravians early in his life. As a priest of the Church of England he accomplished his religious duties with great conscientiousness, revealing an enormous capacity for work. In 1735 he went as a missionary to America to convert the Indians. Upon reaching Georgia he was met by a Moravian who bluntly asked him whether he knew Jesus Christ. In spite of this unexpected reception, which he resented at first, Wesley preached to large audiences in America. But he was painfully conscious of the fact that he himself was not yet a converted Christian.

Back in London in 1738 he came to his own, since famous, heartwarming religious experience. When, in a Moravian meeting, he heard a lay brother read Martin Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans he felt his heart "strangely warmed," an occasion often referred to as Wesley's conversion. That evangelical conversion, described in his own diary, occurred on May 24, 1738. When the Church of England refused its pulpit to Wesley and his main co-laborers, especially George Whitefield, the Methodists began preaching in open places. After 1739 they engaged in popular evangelism. They organized those who now followed them in large numbers into a religious community divided into parishes, or congregations (subdivided into "classes"), headed by conservative pastors, who were required to "move" every three years.

Wesley displayed exceptional talent as an organizer and promoter. Theologically he was Arminian, and thus opposed to a deterministic predestinarianism. His favorite themes were Christian perfection and holiness. Methodism greatly changed the cold religious climate of England and brought new life and action to the Anglican Church. It led also to other developments, such as the founding of the London Missionary Society in 1795, the Church Missionary Society in 1799, the Religious Tract Society in 1799, and the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1804. Methodism also had political and economic influence. The abolition of Negro slavery in the British colonies by Parliament in 1833 was chiefly the work of William Wilberforce, who was strongly influenced by the Methodists. Indeed, it would be difficult to measure the full effects of John Wesley's preaching.

VIII. High Lights of the Past Two Centuries

Rationalism and Deism.—Not only was Western Europe torn by Protestant and Catholic rivalries, but among Protestants there were endless theological discussions, sometimes within the same denomination. The Lutherans had attempted to define their views in final form in the Formula of Concord (1580). The Calvinists had reached some sort of agreement of teaching at the Synod of Dort in 1618, and also by the Consensus Helveticus of 1675. The wars of religion that tortured all European countries caused many people to turn against religion in general, and a rationalistic, anti-Christian reaction was the natural result. Many English deists—who conceived of God as a remote being so busy with other affairs that He had little or no time for this world and its problems—took a definite stand against the ecclesiastical conservatism of the Anglican Church and against the dogmatism of the Puritans as well. Their avowed aim was to revert to a religion of nature and to discard revealed religion, that is, the religion of the Bible. The French philosopher René Descartes (1596–1650) doubted knowledge in general, excepting morals and religion. Basing his philosophy on self-reality, he said doubt is real; doubting is thinking. He expressed it in the well-known formula *cogito ergo sum*, "I think, therefore I am." There was an ever-increasing trend toward reason, until reason was finally deified and worshiped for a short period during the French Revolution.

Those who did not altogether discard Christianity attempted to make it conform with reason. John Locke (1632–1704) rejected whatever was contrary to reason as being inadmissible. In his work entitled *The Reasonableness of Christianity* (1695), while holding that the Bible contains truths that human reason could not discover and that are attested by miracles, Locke maintained that nothing in the central messages of the Scriptures is contrary to reason, and that miracles are not unreasonable. By stressing the ethics of Jesus and the consonance of Christianity and reason, Locke hoped to bypass theological argumentation. He was an ardent advocate of religious toleration.

Some scientists remained loyal to the teachings of revealed religion as set forth in Scripture. One remarkable example is Isaac Newton (1642–1727), a genius in the field of mathematics and physics and author of the theory of universal gravitation. Newton held that the ideas of time and space are not absolute, a concept that was re-examined by Albert Einstein, who in his studies in relativity claimed that human notions concerning time and space are relative to the observer. Einstein spoke of Newton as not only an inventor of genius in respect to specific methods and to mathematical and physical demonstrations, but also as a master of the empirical material then known. Newton was a dedicated and devoted student of Bible prophecy; he traced fulfillments of Bible prophecy throughout history. His *Observations Upon the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John*, 1733, published posthumously, was the outcome of many years of study.

Quite the opposite of Newton's ideas were those of Henry St. John Bolingbroke (1678–1751). Despising all cults that were the product of enthusiasm, fraud, and superstition, he nevertheless conceded to Christianity the right to ration truth. An advocate of freedom of thought, he supported an established church in the interests of the state and of public morals. Even greater was the influence of David Hume (1711–1776), whose deistic criticism emancipated the scientific method from the concept of a deity achieved through reason. Hume directed his criticism against the justification of religion by means other than rational. He admitted the possibility of miraculous occurrences, but maintained that there existed a possibility of error on the part of the observer or historian. Prominent among those who rejected the Christian way of salvation was Edward Gibbon (1737–1794), whose *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* attempted to give a dignified and pragmatic treatment of the rise of Christianity. In the 19th century the fundamental principles of deism were subjected to the influence of skepticism, pessimism, and pantheism, but concepts of so-called natural religion largely retained their old character.

Deism had many facets. In general, deists believed in a God who created the original cell of life. They thought that the God of the universe, the great Builder and “watchmaker,” made universal laws that are in accord with reason. All practices and beliefs that cannot be understood or endorsed by reason must be discarded as superstition; they are used by the clergy for profit. Deists reject the belief that God has ever revealed His will to men; extreme deists hold that God creates, but maintains no connection with His creatures. Therefore they reject the church, the Scriptures, and faith in Christ as God incarnate. They teach that a man can find his own way to happiness and the improvement of his intellectual lot without the assistance of religion.

The 18th-century insistence on reason applied not only to philosophy and religion but to politics as well. When “enlightened despots” such as Frederick II and Joseph II ruled

in the name of reason they enacted laws in the interest of their subjects. For instance, slavery was to be abolished because its abolition was reasonable. There was a general desire to enlighten the people and to popularize scientific knowledge. This enlightened rule was fostered, particularly in France, by the deists, many of whom were among the Encyclopedists. The most eloquent of French deists was Voltaire (1694–1778), a clever, daring critic who entered into a brilliant polemic against intolerance in church and state as well as against the claims of a transcendent church. Voltaire was greatly influenced by Newton, but his ideas on toleration came mostly from Locke and Shaftesbury. He had views not unlike those of the self-styled philosophers, the Encyclopedists, who held that God indeed existed and that He had created the world, but that all religious institutions are impostures. Voltaire's statements were clear and extremely witty, but Voltaire himself was neither deep nor methodical, and his work can be referred to as "a chaos of clear ideas." He was an avowed enemy of Christian teaching; he summed up his views by stating that "dogma leads to fanaticism and strife; but morality [ethics] leads to harmony." His greatest contribution was his courageous and eloquent defense of freedom of opinion and liberty of expression. He openly took the defense of those who were unjustly persecuted because of their ideas. He risked his fortune and his reputation in order to rehabilitate the families of Protestants such as Jean Calas, and politicians like the French governor of India, Lally-Tollendal, who had been unjustly accused of mismanagement. Voltaire was an infidel because he rejected the Christian way of salvation, but he was not an atheist. His last words were, "I die adoring God, loving my friends, not hating my enemies, and detesting superstition" (S. G. Tallentyre, *Voltaire in His Letters*, p. 222).

His contemporary, J. J. Rousseau of Geneva, saw the individual conscience as the center of religion. He conceived that man is good by nature, but that he becomes corrupt by associating with other men. Rousseau (1712–1778) proceeded to demonstrate that man must be educated on an entirely different basis than heretofore (*Émile*), that he must change his concept of the world and justice in general (*Essay on Inequality*), and that the state must be reorganized, based on mutual agreements among the various social classes (*Social Contract*). His ideas directly inspired 19th-century socialism. The basic element of religion he considered to be feeling, or sentiment. To Rousseau sentiment was the basis of a metaphysical system, and this the result of experience under the influence of philosophy, but redeemed from formalism by constant reference to sentimentality and emotion as the primary source of religion. Rousseau found the essence of religion, not in the cultivated intellect, but in the naïve and disinterested understanding of the uncultured. With Rousseau natural religion had a new meaning: "Nature," by him no longer considered as universality in the cosmic order, is primitive simplicity and sincerity in contrast with artificiality.

Rationalism and deism attempted to eliminate from religion its very essence; deism is not an answer to the question of how man can reach salvation and obtain redemption and reconciliation; it is merely a philosophy attempting to explain the world. One of the disciples of rationalism was the German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724–1804), who pointed to the limits of human intelligence, using the principle of ethics. He argued that God and the reality of the living soul are the postulates of practical reason. Kant's contributions from a religious and practical point of view consist in his insistence on duty and the immutable fact of God's moral law.

The French Revolution and Christianity.—Whereas the Middle Ages were favorable to an increase of papal power, the influence of rationalism and the increase of knowledge in the 18th century helped to develop civil and political power. Particularly in France, secularism found a ready soil. The Gallican (French) Church had attempted to put a national stamp on Catholicism. By the Concordat of Bologna, 1516, the kings had the right to appoint the bishops. The power of the state was still more increased by the Reformation. In 17th-century France the pope had only a limited jurisdiction and was strictly confined to religious matters; he was denied all interference in temporal affairs. In the 18th century, civilian communities were no longer considered dependent on the church, and the state gained an ever-increasing ascendancy in France.

The state was considered a means of obtaining liberty and happiness. This notion was held in various Western countries and even in the colonies. It is basic in the American Declaration of Independence, where “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness” are mentioned as the fundamental inalienable rights of man.

The French Revolution was another product of the same concept. There was an urge to build a world based on the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity, and to realize at last an order of things that would respect the “rights of man.” The minds of men were ready for a change, and feudal society in France came to an end. New ideas eloquently created a climate for the Revolution, which started in 1789 when the representatives of the three orders of French society met in Versailles. They were possessed of no intention to overthrow the government of Louis XVI. There were, however, complaints concerning abuses in taxation, representation, and general injustice toward the majority of the population, the Third Estate. An elaborate constitution was drawn up that would limit the absolute power of the monarchy, one section of it being the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, by which the National Assembly would recognize the supremacy of the state, and the church was to be subservient to the state.

In 1792, when France declared war on Austria, the revolution stepped up its pace and became more aggressive and violently revolutionary by eliminating the erstwhile “enemies” of the people, the aristocrats, and the political and social institutions through which they had enforced their will. The constitution was voided in June, 1792, and in August the first serious popular uprising led to the imprisonment of the king and to his trial and execution five months later. In 1793 an anti-Christian wave swept over the land, and war was declared on religion. Reason was deified, and many churches became so-called temples of Reason. For several weeks the most rabid atheists held absolute sway, but after a short time the Cult of Reason was replaced by the Cult of the Supreme Being. When Napoleon became first consul he concluded a concordat with the church in 1801, granting the papacy many of its former privileges.

The Catholic Church in the 18th Century; The Jansenists.—The Jesuits excelled in the art of transforming so-called mortal sins into venial sins by stretching mental reservation and by using an ambiguous construction of language (amphibole). They went so far as to state that one could act against one’s own conscience as long as “probable opinion” is available. The teacher of probabilism was the Jesuit Escobar. Even the papacy condemned his ideas, and therefore he formally repudiated his teachings on probabilism in 1687, but continued to teach them in another form. The most serious foes of the Jesuits were the Jansenists, who went back to the Augustinian concept of salvation by grace alone. The founder of Jansenism was a Dutch professor at Louvain, Cornelius Jansen

(1585–1638). He closely followed Augustine’s teachings, whose works he had read thirty times. Jansen was particularly attracted by Augustine’s teaching on grace as it had developed in his struggle against the Pelagians. In his work *Augustinus*, Jansen taught that God’s grace is the only means of salvation. He endorsed the doctrine of double predestination (men are predestined either to salvation or to damnation). The Jesuits, on the other hand, insisted on the doctrine that man by free will cooperates in his own salvation and *makes* his own redemption to a large degree. The center of Jansenism in France was the Abbey of Port Royal near Paris, where a number of remarkable people such as Nicole, the Arnaulds, Du Vergier, the prior of St. Cyran, and particularly the brilliant physicist and mathematician Blaise Pascal (1623–1662) lived according to the ideas of Jansen.

Pascal undertook to stigmatize and expose the fallacious reasoning of Jesuit casuistry. In his *Provincial Letters* (the first of which appeared in 1656), published in sixty editions, Pascal ably countered the system of the Jesuits by his brilliant and somewhat ironic invectives. Pascal also undertook to write a scientist’s apology of Christianity, but death overtook him while he was relatively young. His jottings and notes for his works were published as *Pensées* (“Thoughts”), and even so remain one of the beautiful and masterful apologies of Christianity.

As for the Jesuits, their activities expanded into many fields of endeavor, suggesting Machiavellian methods even in public finance, commerce, and politics. Deep resentment was the result, and the Jesuits soon felt the opposition of several governments. Their order was ousted from Portugal in 1759, from France in 1764, and from Naples in 1767. In 1773 Pope Clement XIV suspended the order, but his successor hastened to re-establish it.

The Catholic Church in the 19th Century.—The Catholic Church was also affected by liberalism, through the efforts of Robert de Lamennais, but in 1850 this trend toward liberalism was suppressed by what is known as ultramontanism. The latter looked “beyond the mountains”—meaning to the pope in Rome—for authority and direction in matters of faith and philosophy. Pius IX (1846–1878) completely removed from Catholicism any trace of moderation. In 1854 the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary was proclaimed. The Syllabus of Errors (1864) accused the modern state of being a means of propagating indifference and irreligion. It denounced freedom of conscience and condemned Bible societies as “pests.” In 1870 the doctrine of papal infallibility was proclaimed by the Vatican Council and made retroactive. “Infallibility” means that a papal decision pronounced *ex cathedra*—with the aim of instructing the church what to believe and to do—becomes authoritative for the church. Thus the matter of the supreme authority of the church over the conscience, left undecided at Trent, was officially realized. The promulgation of this dogma caused a split in the church. There were men, such as Gratry, Dupanloup, and Maret, who preferred to make church councils the ultimate authority within the church. These “Old Catholics” refused to support the decree of papal infallibility and went their own way. But, for practical purposes, the Jesuits and the Redemptorists (founded by A. Liguori in 1732) were able to make victory for the church complete.

In Germany events took a different turn. In 1873 Bismarck ordered that Catholic and Protestant cults be placed under state control. Ministers were to be trained and to be appointed by the state. The ultramontanist Catholics, of course, resisted this policy

successfully in a monumental struggle known as *Kulturkampf* ("culture struggle"). In fact, in 1880 they forced Bismarck, known as the "chancellor of iron and blood," to concede to their demands and to desist from further attacks on the Catholic Church. Needing the Catholic vote, he made an agreement with Pope Leo XIII. A similar situation existed in France, where an increasingly strong anticlerical movement led by Léon Gambetta came into existence. His watchcry was, "Clericalism—that is the enemy." Great efforts were made to free the country from the domination of the priests, who were no longer allowed to teach in the public schools. But the clerical-anticlerical issue continued to exist, as was evidenced in the sensational case of Dreyfus in 1898. Finally, in 1905, separation of church and state was adopted in France. The republic guaranteed freedom of worship and refused to recognize or subsidize any religious confession. Church properties continued to belong to the state, which placed them freely at the disposal of duly constituted churches who worshiped in them. The pope was obviously opposed to this law of separation, and further expressed concern, not only about freedom of religion, but about the increase of modernism in religious ranks, as voiced in Pius X's encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, 1907.

The Anglican Church in the 19th Century.—The Methodists had revived a certain measure of evangelical spirit within the Anglican Church. This trend developed into what came to be called Low Church, which was preponderant in the first half of the 19th century. The so-called High Church wing of the Anglican Church stresses the supposed apostolic and divine origin of that church, and makes much of form and ritual, whereas the Low Church considers the church as an institution to be mainly human in its origin and minimizes form and ritual. The evangelical element in the Low Church, particularly under the leadership of Lord Shaftesbury, was chiefly responsible for the suppression of certain social abuses and the creation of many institutions dedicated to welfare and to home and foreign missionary endeavor. The Low Church was not primarily concerned with theological matters or with the forms of worship. The rather prosaic dogmatism of the Low Church helped to provoke a mystic and ritualistic reaction named Puseyism, after its leader, Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800–1882), professor of Hebrew at Oxford.

Beginning in 1833, Pusey and his friends John Henry Newman (1801–1890) and John Keble (1792–1866) published a series of *Tracts for the Times*. In these tracts the various Oxford theologians reverted to the sacraments as the only channel by which divine grace could be conveyed to the sinner, and only when properly administered by a duly ordained priest. The conviction of these men was that the true church of the 19th century must revert to the church of the 4th century and that the Anglican Church has its roots in the church of the Apostolic Fathers. The church alone could convey salvation and teach the true meaning of the Scriptures. In 1845 Newman was converted to Roman Catholicism. The men of the Puseyist movement were remarkably intelligent and zealous and able to reach certain men and women that Methodism had not been able to contact. Opposed to these Anglo-Catholics was the so-called Broad Church (latitudinarian) wing of the Anglican Church. Its members were staunch rationalists, opposed to the ritualistic formalism of the Puseyists and to the literalistic dogmatism of the Low Church party.

Modern Theology.—Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834), sometimes referred to as the "father of modern theology," taught that Christianity is, above all else, a way of life and that piety is the best source of Christian teaching. Alexandre Vinet had a similar influence on French theology. Like Pascal, Vinet referred to conscience as the essence of

Christianity. Theological radicalism—the school of Tübingen—led to a more rigorous historical method in the study of the Bible and its background. Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792–1860) endeavored to date the writings of the New Testament. David Friedrich Strauss (1808–1874), in his first *Life of Jesus* (1835), presented the history of the gospel as a myth created by the imaginations of the early Christians and conditioned by messianic prophecies and hopes. In France, Ernest Renan (1823–1892) described the powerful personality of Christ, but Renan saw in Jesus a visionary who was a creation, and the victim, of His times (*Life of Jesus*, 1862). A great number of other “lives of Jesus” following the so-called historical, or rationalistic, method were published in the 19th century. Higher critics considered the Bible to be no different from any other book, and denying the basic fact of divine revelation, analyzed the Scriptures as they would an ordinary text.

Nineteenth-century liberalism was a revolt against the despotism of the state. It was an era when numerous free churches came into existence. In 1900 the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church, which was independent from the state, merged and formed the United Free Church of Scotland, comprising some fifteen hundred parishes. Finally, in 1929, the official state Church of Scotland and the United Free Church merged into one, when it was ascertained that the church would be autonomous and would not be subject to state intervention.

Attempts to Unify Protestantism.—While Catholicism centralized its teachings in the Council of Trent and strengthened the papal power by the proclamation of papal infallibility in 1870, Protestants have been haunted by the dream of a federation of all the churches. More and more the conviction has grown that denominational differences should not prevent the large denominations and the so-called historic churches from pooling their resources and carrying on a common program of activity at home and abroad.

From its inception the Christian church has been divided because of heresy and idolatry within and opposition from without. The two greatest blows to the unity of Christendom came in the 11th century, when the East and the West were divided, and in the 16th century, when the Reformation broke up the Western Catholic Church. Today the divisions in Protestantism are so great that the leaders of Ecumenism—the movement for church union—do not now think of attempting to unite all denominations. Their primary objective is to confine themselves to the unity of the “churches,” not of the “church.” They would divide Christendom into a number of great church “families,” such as Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Lutheran, Calvinist, Methodist, and Independents.

The attempt to unite Protestants started in Scotland with the creation in 1846 of the Evangelical Alliance, when 200 clergymen belonging to 217 different denominations, all claiming to belong to orthodox Protestantism, accepted the challenge to unite. Another such effort was the Young Men’s Christian Alliance, with headquarters in Geneva. In 1895 the World Christian Endeavor Union formed a federation of Christian young people. Very significant was the World’s Student Christian Federation, founded in 1895 by John R. Mott.

The 20th-century ecumenical movement began in 1910 with its first Edinburgh meeting. Of this World Missionary Conference, John R. Mott was presiding officer and organizer. At that time the urgency of Christian united effort was discussed, especially

with reference to missions. A Faith and Order conference was also planned, but was canceled when World War I made it impossible for the delegates to assemble. In 1920 the Lambeth Conference, spearheaded by the Anglicans, sent out a call for Christian unity. In 1925 the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work met, with the gifted Swedish Lutheran bishop, Nathan Söderblom, as its sponsor. In 1927 the World Conference on Faith and Order met in Lausanne. In 1937 two meetings were held, a conference at Oxford on "Life and Work" (stressing practical Christianity), and a conference at Edinburgh on "Faith and Order," led by the Frenchman, Pastor Marc Boegner. At a similar conference at Utrecht in 1938 the leading clergymen were Archbishop William Temple and John R. Mott.

In 1948 an important ecumenical meeting convened at Amsterdam under the slogan, "Man's Disorder and God's Design." Four hundred fifty delegates attended, and it was there that the World Council of Churches was officially called into existence. Many religious bodies, such as the Unitarians, Lutherans (Missouri Synod), Christian Scientists, Mormons, Southern Baptists, Seventh-day Adventists, and, of course, the Roman Catholics, did not join. Although it is conceivable that Ecumenism might unite the churches, at least outwardly, there are fundamental internal obstacles that seem almost insurmountable.

Since the 1961 General Assembly of the World Council of Churches in New Delhi, when the majority of the members of the Orthodox Churches found themselves within the World Council, there has been greater concern for seeing also the Roman Catholic Church, 700 million strong, join the World Council of Churches in the future.

Bibliography

°On Pre-Reformation Times

- COULTON, G. G. *Five Centuries of Religion*. Vol. 4. *The Last Days of Medieval Monachism*. Cambridge University Press: 1950. By a distinguished specialist, and based on an extensive use of sources.
- LEA, HENRY CHARLES. *A History of the Inquisition of Spain*. 4 vols. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1906–1907. A standard work.
- LECHLER, GOTTHARD VICTOR. *John Wycliffe and His English Precursors*. Translated by P. Lorimer. 2 vols. London: The Religious Tract Society, 1884. Still the most exhaustive biography on Wyclif.
- PASTOR, LUDWIG. *The History of the Popes From the Close of the Middle Ages*. Translated from the German by various scholars. 36 vols. St. Louis: 1902–1950. This is a standard work by a Catholic scholar who used the archives of the Vatican.
- SPINKA, MATTHEW. *John Hus and the Czech Reform*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941. An excellent study stressing some of the ways in which Hus differed from Wyclif, and how Hus desired a reformation of the church.

°On the Reformation

- BAINTON, ROLAND H. *The Reformation of the 16th Century*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1952. This is a popular brief summary by an outstanding Luther specialist.
- FLICK, ALEXANDER CLARENCE. *Decline of the Medieval Church*. 2 vols. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930.
- GOLDSCHMIDT, E. P. *The Printed Book of the Renaissance*. Toronto: The Macmillan Company, 1950.
- GRIMM, HAROLD JOHN. *The Reformation Era*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954. A general survey from 1500 to 1650. Excellent and concise.
- HUISINGA, JOHAN. *The Waning of the Middle Ages*. London: E. Arnold & Co., 1924.
- HYMA, ALBERT. *Renaissance to Reformation*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1951.
- _____. *The Christian Renaissance*. Grand Rapids: The Reformed Press, 1924.
- JOHANSEN, JOHANNES. *History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages*. 17 vols. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1896–1925. From a Catholic point of view.
- KIDD, B. J. *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1911. A useful collection of texts, many dealing with Lutheranism.

LEA, HENRY CHARLES. *History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences*. 3 vols. Philadelphia: Lea Brothers and Co., 1896.

RANDALL, JOHN HERMAN, JR. *The Making of the Modern Mind*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1926.

SMITH, PRESERVED. *The Age of the Reformation*. New York: H. Holt & Co., 1920. An excellent survey of the Catholic and Protestant attempts to reform the church.

TAYLOR, HENRY OSBORN. *The Mediaeval Mind*. 2 vols. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930.

°On Martin Luther

BAINTON, ROLAND H. *Here I Stand*. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Cokesbury Press, 1950. This is a beautiful picture of Martin Luther based on accurate scholarship and thorough knowledge of the sources and secondary works, written by a stylist.

BOEHMER, H. *Road to Reformation*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1946. A well-written defense of Luther. Luther's life had been attacked by Roman Catholic writers, especially the Jesuits Denifle and Grisar; and Boehmer attempted to defend Luther as a leader and a man.

GRISAR, HARTMANN. *Luther*. Translated from the German by E. M. Lamond. 6 vols. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1913–1919. A critical study of the Protestant Reformer by a Jesuit.

LANDEEN, WILLIAM M. *Martin Luther's Religious Thought*. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1971. An excellent study.

SCHWIEBERT, ERNEST GEORGE. *Luther and His Times; the Reformation From a New Perspective*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950. A comprehensive study by an American Lutheran, particularly interesting for the educational background of Luther and a study of the German universities of that time.

Works of Martin Luther. Edited by Henry Eysta Jacobs. Philadelphia: A. J. Holman Co., 1915–1932. An edition of Luther's works in English.

°On Ulrich Zwingli

KÖHLER, WALTHER. *Huldrych Zwingli*. Stuttgart: K. F. Koehler, 1952.

SIMPSON, S. *Life of Uhlrich Zwingli, Swiss Patriot and Reformer*. New York: The Baker & Taylor Co., 1902. This work is based on extensive research.

ZWINGLI, U. "Sämtliche Werke" in the *Corpus Reformation*, 2d series, vols. 88–100. Herausgegeben von Dr. Emil Egli ... und Dr. George Finsler. Berlin and Leipzig: C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn, and Leipzig, M. Heinsius Nachfolger, 1905–1944.

°On John Calvin

BEZA, THEODORE. *The Life of John Calvin*. Translated by H. Beveridge. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1909.

CALVIN, JOHN. *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Translated from Latin. 7th Amer. ed. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936.

CHOISY, EUGENE. *Calvin, Educateur des consciences*. [Paris]: Editions de "La Cause," n.d.

WENDEL, FRANCOIS. *Calvin: The Origins and Development of His Religious Thought*. Translated by Philip Mairet. New York: Harper and Row, 1963. An excellent modern study of Calvin's life, especially valuable on his theological teachings.

°On Ignatius of Loyola and the Catholic Reformation

BOEHMER, HEINRICH. *The Jesuits*. Philadelphia: The Castle Press, 1928. One of the best histories of the Jesuits.

DUDON, PAUL. *St. Ignatius of Loyola*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1949. Written by a Jesuit and based on extensive research.

OUTRAM, HENRY. *The Spirit of the Counter Reformation*. Edited with a postscript by John Bossy. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1970. Considered a classic.

SEDGWICK, HENRY DWIGHT. *Ignatius of Loyola*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923. By a non-Catholic.

°On the Reformation in the British Isles

BUCHAN, K. *Oliver Cromwell*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934.

BURRAGE, CHAMPLIN. *The Early English Dissenters in the Light of the Recent Research*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1912. Very valuable because it contains a great selection of original documents.

CLARKE, HENRY WILLIAM. *History of English Non-Conformity From Wycliffe to the Close of the 19th Century*. 2 vols. London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1911–1913.

DAVIES, HORTON. *The English Free Churches*. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

DICKENS, ARTHUR G. *The English Reformation*. New York: Schocken Books, 1964.

HUGHES, PHILIP. *The Reformation in England*. 2 vols. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951.
UNDERWOOD, ALFRED CLAIR. *A History of the English Baptists*. London: 1947.
WESTCOTT, BROOKE FOSS. *A General View of the History of the English Bible*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

²Nichol, F. D. (1978). *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary : The Holy Bible with exegetical and expository comment*. Commentary Reference Series (Php 1:1). Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.